THE OLD TESTAMENT PROMISE OF THE LAND AS REINTERPRETED IN FIRST AND SECOND CENTURY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

A dissertation by
RICHARD JAMES VAIR

presented to
The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California

April, 7, 1979

Committee Signatures:

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.
Chairman

Michael D. Guinan

John S. Coolidge

to

my beloved parents

RICHARD JOSEPH VAIR

and

VIVIAN FLORINE FOSTER VAIR

Special Acknowledgement

for

the patience, love, and support

of my wife and two sons

Betty Jean Roberts

David Calvin

Jonathan Charles

PREFACE

Part 1 of this study will summarize the research of the land-promise theme in the literature prior to the later New Testament books. There is a great deal of diversity of opinion among scholars in respect to this particular theme and many subjects which are relevant in any study of it. The purpose of Part 1 is to provide a background for the examination of the land-promise theme in the later New Testament books and the Christian and quasi-Christian literature of the second century. Because of the large amount of literature surveyed and the diversity of scholarly interpretation, Part 1 is heavily annotated. In no sense are the notes intended to be exhaustive. They are relatively comprehensive and endeavor to provide the reader with a fair evaluation of the background material in respect to the theme of the promised land and the traditions associated with it.

Part 2 examines the late first and second century Christian and quasi-Christian literature. In this literature the promise of blessing in the land is not expected as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. That is to say, it is not understood through the perspective of the historical Jewish traditions associated with it.

Part 3 examines the later New Testament books and the relevant literature up to and including Irenaeus' Against Heresies. In this literature the land-promise theme and the historical Jewish traditions associated with it are affirmed as an apocalyptic hope of the Church.

Neither Part 2 nor Part 3 require the extensive annotation which is present in Part 1. This is in part due to the fact that the land-promise theme has not been studied in this literature. Further, the examination of this theme in the body of this thesis is hopefully thorough and clear.

This thesis could not have been accomplished without the help and support of many colleagues, the guidance and instruction of my professors, the patience of Mrs. Elizabeth Over and her staff, and the understanding of President Claude Welch. I genuinely appreciated the valuable guidance and constructive criticism of the members of my committee: Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., Father Michael Guinan, O. F. M., Father Neal Flanagan, O. S. M., and Professor John S.

UMI

Coolidge of the University of California, Berkeley.

Certain people merit special recognition: the late Clifton L. Fowler who introduced me to the study of theology and the late Professor Paul Alexander who, although ill, graciously devoted a lot of time to me. Others that should be mentioned for personal help at a time of need are Max Milton Pearse, Jr., Frank Arthur Adamson, Nell MacVeagh and Bernard David Wiegand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1: THE CONCEPT OF THE LAND AS AN APOCALYPTIC HOPE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, THE INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE AND THE EARLIER BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Chapter 1:
The Promise of the Land and the Patriarchs. 1

Chapter 2:
The Promise of the Land and the Mosaic Covenant 13

Chapter 3:
The Promise of the Land and the Davidic Covenant. 18

Chapter 4:
The Promise of the Land from the Exile to the Earlier Literature of the New Testament. 32

PART 2: LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY IN WHICH THE PROMISE OF THE LAND IS NOT EXPECTED IN ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL OR APOCALYPTIC SENSE

Introduction 53

Chapter 1:
Rome. 56

Chapter 2:
Syria-Palestine 89

Chapter 3:
Asia Minor. 96

Chapter 4:
Egypt 118

Chapter 5:
The Library of Nag Hammadi. 120

PART 3: LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY IN WHICH THE PROMISE OF THE LAND IS EXPECTED IN ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL OR APOCALYPTIC SENSE

Chapter 1:
Asia Minor. 135

Chapter 2:
Syria 182

Chapter 3:
Eastern 207

Chapter 4:
An Introduction to Justin: An explanation why the land theme is absent in his Apologetic Literature and the Apologies of the second century. 222

Chapter 5:
The West: Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. 231

Chapter 6:
The West: Irenaeus' Against Heresies, ... 248

Conclusion . . . .

Bibliography . . . .

PART 1

THE CONCEPT OF THE LAND AS AN APOCALYPTIC HOPE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, THE INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE AND THE EARLIER BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER 1

THE PROMISE OF THE LAND AND THE PATRIARCHS

In 1943, Gerhard von Rad proposed that in the whole of the Hexateuch in all its sources, in all their parts, there is probably no subject as important as the promised land, and that it is this theme which gives the Hexateuch its distinctive theological character.[1] The story of the exodus and the occupation of the land by the Israelite tribes is presented as the fulfillment of the promise made to the patriarchs.[2] Yet, behind this story are two distinct and different ancient traditions, both of which are concerned with promised land in terms of covenant, but covenants which are very different -- so dif-

---

[1] Gerhard von Rad, The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken, Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966, p. 79 (hereafter cited as Problem of the Hexateuch). W. D. Davies stressed the importance of the Pentateuch: "However much the Prophets and the Writings gained in significance, in later ages the Pentateuch remained the bedrock of revelation for Jews, so that the references to the promised land embedded in it must be accorded great weight in any assessment of Judaism." The Gospel and the Land, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1974, p. 24 (hereafter cited as Gospel and Land).

It is important to point out that there is no general scholarly concensus concerning the analysis of the Hexateuch as a literary corpus. We will assume as an assured minimum that the Tetrateuch is the literary corpus of the Yahwistic work. For further discussion of this problem see the following: Peter R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968, pp. 62-63; Ronald de Vaux, The Early History of Israel, trans. David Smith, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978, pp. 164-165 (hereafter cited as Early History of Israel); William G. Denver and W. Malcolm Clark, "The Patriarchal Traditions," in Israelite and Judaean History, eds., John H. Hayes and J. Maxwell Miller, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977, pp. 70-148 (hereafter cited as "Patriarchal Traditions"); Thomas L. Thompson and Dorothy Irvin, "The Joseph and Moses Narratives," in Israelite and Judaean History, pp. 149-212 (hereafter cited as "Joseph and Moses Narratives").

[2] Von Rad, Problem of the Hexatuech, pp. 92-93; Carrol Stuhlmueller, "The Theology of Creation in Second Isaias," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21, 1959, p. 429 (hereafter cited as "Creation in Second Isaias"). There is no general concensus concerning von Rad's theory of the ancient credo in respect to its antiquity and development distinct from the Sinai tradition.

DeVaux recommends caution: "It is possible to reconstruct the stages by which this tradition [the memory of the exodus, Sinai, and the possession of the land] became the common property of the whole of ferent, in fact, that they provided two opposing ways of understanding Israel's future with the promised land.[3]

First, there is the tradition concerned with the promise of the land to the patriarchs and the Abrahamic covenant. After an account of the primary history, depicting the movement of mankind toward hopelessness and degeneracy, the Yahwist created a context in which a new

---

Israel, but the result is purely conjectural." Early History of Israel, p. 167. J. Philip Hyatt argues that von Rad's primary passages (Deuteronomy 6:20-24, 26:5b-9, and Joshua 24:2-13) are not as ancient as von Rad proposed. In contrast to von Rad, Hyatt believes that the Shema (Deuteronomy 6:4-9) came to embody Israel's kerygmatic faith. See "Were There an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?" in Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert Gordon May, eds. Harry Thomas Frank and William L. Reed, Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1970, pp. 167-170. G. Ernest Wright accepts von Rad's thesis with reservations about the development of the Sinai tradition. See "Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 1, ed. George Arthur Buttrick, New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952, pp. 350-351 (hereafter The Interpreter's Bible cited as IB).

For a further discussion of the wide range of opinions in this respect see Thompson, "Joseph and Moses Narratives," pp. 163-164. Perhaps von Rad's earlier thesis in regard to the land-promise theme is too strongly stated. In substance, however, it still remains a probable hypothesis. See the excellent discussion of John Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd rev. ed., Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972, pp. 68-175 (hereafter cited as History of Israel); John Bright, Covenant and Promise : The Prophetic Understanding of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976, p. 28 n. 20 (hereafter cited as Covenant and Promise).

[3] Walter Zimmerli, Old Testament Theology in Outline, trans. David E. Green, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978 pp. 27-28 (hereafter cited as O. T. Theology in Outline); Bright, History of Israel, pp. 130-138. Bright acknowledges his indebtedness to the position advanced by George E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," The Biblical Archaeologist, 25, 1962, pp. 67-68. See also Moshe Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume, Nashville: Abingdon, p. 189 (hereafter The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume cited as IDBS); Paul A. Riemann, "Covenant, Mosaic," IDBS, p. 195. The present writer is indebted for much of what follows concerning Israel's pre-apocalyptic future hope to the following: John Bright, Covenant and Promises; Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G. W. Anderson, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956; Clifton L. Fowler, Building the Dispensations, Denver: Maranatha Press, 1940.

direction for mankind could begin through Abraham and the people of promise.[4]

> Now the Lord said to Abram, "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who curses you will I curse; and by you all the families of the earth shall bless themselves.
> So Abram went, as the Lord had told him: and Lot went with him. (Genesis 12:1-4a)

Perhaps this promise was originally understood by Israel's ancestors as promise of new pasture, a home, and an escape from starvation. Indeed, as these herdsmen began to settle safely in Palestine, to extend in number throughout Canaan, and to identify their gods with Yahweh, this was understood as the fulfillment of Yahweh's promise to give them the whole land of Canaan.[5] In any event, the Yahwist, with this passage affirms a beginning of the end of the curse, announces a new era of promise and blessing, and creates the background for which he can demonstrate that Yahweh created Israel and granted her the land. While it is significant that the promise of the land is not included at this point, there is good reason to believe that the Yahwist postponed introducing this primary idea until later in order to bring it into singular prominence. This, in fact, is the proposal of von Rad.[6] It is then, this promise and fulfillment dynamic which enables the Yahwist to be faithful to the tradition, and at the same time point the tradition forward in relevance to the historical situation of the tenth century.[7] It is into this dynamic of promise and fulfillment that the Yahwist inserts the account of the Abrahamic covenant in Genesis 15.

---

[4] See Walter Brueggemann, The Land, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977, pp. 6, 15, and n. 16, p. 9; Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975, p. 42 (hereafter cited as O. T. Traditions); Martin Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, trans. Bernhard W. Anderson, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972, pp. 236-237 (hereafter cited as Pentateuchal Traditions); von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 63-69.

Several scholars have argued that before Israel had a formal eschatology, the Hebrews from a very early time had a hope of future blessing. Early poems such as the Blessing of Jacob, the Balaam oracles, the Songs of Moses, Miriam, and Deborah, and some Psalms support this thesis. See Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 133; Bright, History of Israel, pp. 143-144; idem, Covenant and Promise, pp. 18 ff.; Walter Zimmerli, Man and His Hope in the Old Testament, English translation, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., 20, Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1971, pp. 1-55 (hereafter cited as Man and Hope); idem, "Hope in the OT," IDBS, pp. 417-419; Michael Edward Williams, "Eschatology," The New Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. a staff at the Catholic University of America, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967, p. 524 (hereafter this encyclopedia cited as NCE); and Gerhard F. Hasel, The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah, Andrews University Monograph, vol. 5, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1972, pp. 135-159 and 373-390 (hereafter cited as The Remnant); idem, "Remnant," IDBS, pp. 735-736. (All the quotations of Scripture unless otherwise noted are from the Revised Standard Version.

---

[5] There is a considerable diversity of opinion among scholars concerning the "conquest" and settlement of Canaan by the early Hebrews. No less complex is the origin, preservation, and significance of the traditions associated with the occupation of the promised land. John Hayes summarizes four current approaches and methodology in respect to biblical history: (1) the conservative; 2) the archaeological; (3) the traditio-historical; (4) the socio-economic. Hayes seems to imply a fifth approach which synthesizes the other four. Roland de Vaux exemplified this eclectic approach. See John Hayes, "The History of the Study of Israelite and Judaean History," in Israelite and Judaean History, pp. 64-69.

Manfred Weippert has analyzed the wars of the ancient Near East. He showed that the Hittite and Assyrian soldiers believed that their gods fought in their behalf. He therefore concluded that the Israelite amphictyony could not be regarded as a "spezillen... Sakralinstitut" distinct from these other ancient peoples. "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien: Kritische Anmerkungen zu Gerhard von Rads Konzept des 'Heiligen Krieges im alten Israel'," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 84, 1972, pp. 490-493. Weippert seems to have failed to recognize an important point that von Rad, Noth and others have made in this respect: The foundation of the Israelite tribal confederation was religion and not politics. See von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 3-38; Martin Noth, The History of Israel, rev. 2d ed., English translation rev. Peter R. Ackroyd, New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, pp. 85-109; Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 33. Although A. D. H. Mayes rejected the idea of any kind of amphictyony during the period of the Judges or earlier, he recognized the point that the eventual unity of both Judah and the northern tribes was possible because of the long standing common Yahwistic religion. Israel in the Period of the Judges, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., vol. 29, Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1974, pp. 106-107 (hereafter cited as Period of the Judges).

The question remains:, Which approach is more objective in correlating the biblical data with the archaeological and literary data of the Near East? According to W. Malcolm Clark, de Vaux offers "the best synthesis of external evidence with form and tradition research." "Patriarchal Traditions," p. 143. De Vaux rejects the notion that the patriarchs were "great" nomads or caravan traders. He argues that the patriarchs were seminomads who kept sheep and goats. "It is...very probable that the...stages in this evolutionary process from a nomadic to a settled way of life were compressed in the patriarchal conditions." Early History of Israel, pp. 231, 215, 221-228. For other views see the following: John Van Seters, "Patriarchs," IDBS, pp. 645-648; Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966, pp. 48 and 68-70; Bright, History of Israel, p. 139. Walter Brueggemann has proposed that the historical conquest or the lack of it is not essential to the kerygmatic dynamic of promise and fulfillment. "Yahwist," IDBS, pp. 972-973.

---

[6] Von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, p. 84. Walter Zimmerli, The Old Testament and the World, trans. John J. Scullion, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976, pp. 69-70 (hereafter cited as O.T. and the World).

[7] Frank Moore Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London England: Harvard University Press, 1973, pp. 84-86 (hereafter cited as Myth and Epic). George E. Mendenhall makes the following observations concerning the historical context in which the patriarchal traditions regained greater significance: "The Old Testament Constantine, King David, represents a thoroughgoing reassimilation to Late Bronze Age religious ideas and structures. These readapted the authentic traditions of Israel just as radically as the later Achemenids readapted the original message of Zarathustra, or the period of Constantine readapted New Testament Christianity....The Abraham legend became politically functional at Hebron as the Keret Epic (and others) were in Ugarit. Not until the reestablishment of kingship at Hebron was the old political legend again valuable as a means of ideological unification of a diverse population. It is one of the ironies of history that it eventually became a symbol to support the opposite. At any rate, there can be little doubt that the major function of the narrative was to indicate that David as king represented the legitimate successor to the old pre-Israelite dynastic tradition, probably of the Hyksos period." The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition, Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins Press, 1973, pp. 16, 182 (hereafter cited as Tenth Generation). On the hereditary rule of the Achaemenids see Frank Moore Cross, "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," Harvard Theological Review 59, 1966, p. 203 (hereafter cited as "Samaritan and Jewish History"). See also John I. Durham, "Credo, Ancient Israelite," IDBS, p. 197; Brueggemann, "David and His Theologian," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 30, 1968, pp. 158-160 and 174-180.

A relatively certain analysis of the strata and sources of Genesis 15 has not been successful.[8] On the whole, Genesis 15 is regarded as Yahwistic, and the chapter is composed of two sections. The first section verses 1-6, in the form of an oracle of assurance, although it is concerned with the land-promise theme in the form of an inheritance, develops into a promise of progeny. The second section, vss. 7-21, of which 7-12, 17-18 are surely Yahwistic, concentrates on the promise of the land and presents the promise through the making of the covenant. While the two sections were at one time probably independent forms of the land-promise theme to Abraham and his progeny they now belong together in a literary sense, in which the primary emphasis is promise of the land.[9]

---

[8] Noth, Pentateuchal Traditions, p. 28, n. 85; de Vaux, Early History of Israel, pp. 164-165; Norbert Lohfink, Die Landverheissung als Eid, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 28, Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967, p. 114 (hereafter cited as Landverheissung als Eid); Cross, Myth and Epic, p. 293.

[9] Claus Westerman argued that promises occurring in groups of two or more indicate a later origin. This argument lacks conviction. It would seem presumptious to assume that the concepts of a son (posterity) and a place to live in relative security (land and blessing) could not have been organically associated together. Westerman, however, notes the significance of the land-theme: "The story in Gen. 15:7-21 concerns only the promise of the land...the story developed out of the promise." "Promises to the Patriarchs," IDBS, p. 692 (cf. 690-691); Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 29, 147.

In a private seminar on ancient dreams and history, Professor Raphael B. Sealey drew my attention to the possible significance of a different dream pattern of the ancient Greeks and ancient cultures in general. It is not improbable that this phenomenon is important in the presentation of the Abrahamic oath-covenant tradition.

It was the special merit of E. R. Dodds to single out a psychological dream-structure generally unique to primitive and ancient cultures. Dodds made the following relevant observations: (1) the dreamer is the passive recipient of an objective vision; (2) the dreamer spoke not of having a dream, but of seeing a dream; (3) the visitor who bears a message in the dream stands over the dreamer; (4) in divine dreams, a god appears to deliver a message, predict the future, or demand a cult; (5) sometimes the visitor is only an authoritative voice; (6) in the conscious state, the dreamer brings the dream or vision into conformity with his traditional cultural belief-system. The Greeks and the Irrational, Berkeley and Los Angeles; University of California Press, 1963, pp. 104-114.

Little attention has been given by biblical scholars to the vision and deep sleep motifs in Genesis 15. Although Isaac Mendelsohn

It is to be noted that the land promised Abraham by oath, is presented in the form of a covenant in Genesis 15.[10] In diametric

---

indicated that dreams or night visions were considered highly significant in the ancient Near East as supernatural messages, he did not discuss Genesis 15 in light of this ("Dream; Dreamer," IDB, vol. 1, p. 868). In contradistinction to Hermann Gunkel, John Skinner, and Gerhard von Rad, Hugh White argued that the dream motif (usually associated with E) in Genesis 26:10-22 is intimately associated with the promise (usually associated with J). "The Divine Oath in Genesis," Journal of Biblical Literature, 92, 1973, pp. 170-171 (hereafter cited as "Divine Oath in Genesis").

It is impossible to determine whether J has reworked E in Genesis 15. If E has any significant contribution to the Abrahamic oath-covenant, it may be the kerygmatic dynamic of integrating faith and obedience suggested by Hans Walter Wolff in respect to the story of the sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22. "The Elohistic Fragments in the Pentateuch," trans. Keith R. Crim, Interpretation, 26, 1972, p. 172 (hereafter cited as "Elohistic Fragments"). In respect to the covenant in Genesis 15, God's promise is accompanied by Abraham's response of faith. Later, it is Abraham's faith or fear of God (Genesis 22:8) which enables Abraham to obey God. This results in the affirmation of the promise (Genesis 22:16-17).

[10] It is possible that later tradition used an oath-form as the source of the covenant described in Genesis 15. See Lohfink, Landverheissung als Eid, p. 117. Dennis J. McCarthy indicated the weakness of this argument which attempts to interpret Genesis 15 in light of Genesis 24.7. See Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions, English translation 1972, 4th reprint ed., Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976, pp. 59-61 (hereafter O. T. Covenant: A Survey). McCarthy provided a fair assessment of the positions up to 1969. Lohfink's thesis, in substance has been reiterated. See Hugh C. White, "Divine Oath in Genesis," pp. 178-179. Other scholars have argued that the oath of the covenant does not indicate an earlier layer of the tradition. See Cross, Myth and Epic, p. 273; Zimmerli, O.T.Theology in Outline, p. 65; de Vaux, Early History of Israel, pp. 451-452; Moshe Weinfeld, "Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 93.2, 1973, pp. 190 and 197-199 (hereafter cited as "Covenant Terminology"). In another article, Weinfeld presents a striking parallel to the oath-covenant of Genesis 15: "A similar oath occurs in the Abba-El--Yarimlim deed where Abba-El, the donor, takes the oath by cutting the neck of a lamb... saying: '(May I be cursed) if I take back what I gave you.' In another document which completes the data of this gift we read: 'On that day Abba-El in exchange for Irridi gave the city...on that day Yarimlim delivered (or brought up) to Istar...' which seems to reflect a situation similar to that of the covenant in Gen. XV, i.e., that the inferior party delivers the animals while the superior swears the oath." "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 90.2, 1970, pp. 196-197 (hereafter cited as "Covenant of Grant in O.T. and Near East").

opposition to the obligatory Mosaic covenants (e.g. in Exodus and Deuteronomy), the covenant with Abraham is a promissory type which has no particular conditions attached to it. Though Abraham's loyalty is assumed, there are no commandments or list of obligations prerequisite for the giving of the land promised in the covenant. Indeed, Abraham is presented as passive in the making of the covenant, and it is God who passes through the slaughtered animal parts and unconditionally binds himself to make the covenant good.[11]

Moshe Weinfeld demonstrated that the promissory covenant with Abraham is modeled on the royal grant in the ancient Near East. Just as the royal grant was bestowed as a gift on an individual who had loyally served his master, so Abraham is promised the land as a gift because he had distinguished himself with God by both believing God and obeying God's call. Indeed, the gift of land is one of the most prominent gifts of the Hittite royal grant, and the giving of it is both unconditional and graciously extended to the recipient's descendant, so that it is never to be taken away. Thus we read:

> After you, your son and grandson will possess it; nobody will take it away from them. If one of your descendants sins, the king will prosecute him, ...but nobody will take away either his house or his land in order to give it to a descendant of somebody else. (KBO, IV, 10, obverse 8-14)[12]

In the same way, the Abrahamic covenant is considered valid forever, so that should Israel sin, punishment will ensue; but the covenant with the patriarchs will not be broken (Leviticus 26:43-45). Further, just as recipient in the Assyrian royal grant of Assurbanipal is designated friend and ally, so is Abraham designated the friend of God. Genesis 15, therefore, presents the land as a gracious gift unconditionally given to Abraham and his descendants. Though it is true that certain passages seem to contradict the unconditionality of the patriarchal covenant (e.g. Genesis 18:19) this was the result of interpretations in a later state of Israelite history which sought to provide a reason for the exile of Northern Israel or to warn against the threat of Canaanite syncretism.[13] Indeed, in contradistinction to this, the Priestly source endeavored to heighten the promissory nature and unconditionality of the land as a gift in the patriarchal covenant.[14]

---

[11] George E. Mendenhall, "Covenant," The Intepreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4 vols., ed. George Arthur Buttrick, New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, vol. 1, pp. 717-718 (hereafter The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible cited as IDB); C. F. Keil and Franz J. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Pentateuch, vol. 1, trans. James Martin, reprint, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp. 209-219; Weinfeld, "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," p. 184; Clifton L. Fowler, Building the Dispensations, pp. 59-60.

[12] Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," IDBS, p. 190; idem, "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," pp. 189-195.

---

[13] Wolff, "Elohistic Fragments," p. 173. Genesis 18:19 is generally considered an interpolation by a later hand. See Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 270 and p. 273, n. 231; John H. Marks, "The Book of Genesis," The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary: Introduction and Commentary for Each Book of the Bible Including the Apocrypha with General Articles, ed. Charles M. Laymon, Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1971, pp. 2 and 16-17 (hereafter this commentary cited as Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary); Noth, Pentateuchal Traditions, p. 239, n. 627. There is some ambiguity in Noth's literary analysis of Genesis 18:19. Noth placed vs. 19 in parenthesis in his detailed presentation of the Yahwistic contribution. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1948, p. 29 (Pentateuchal Traditions, p. 28). Although Noth clearly indicated vs. 19 was an interpolation in n. 627 ("mir scheint V. 17f. jahwistisch und nur V. 19 eine Interpolation zu sein"),Bernhard Anderson included vs. 19 in his own literary-analysis-supplement to Noth's book. Pentateuchal Traditions, p. 263. Weinfeld, who believes that there is Deuteronomic phraseology -- "to keep the way of Yahweh" -- in vs. 19, proposed that it was probably the Deuteronomistic redactor who placed the Abrahamic covenant under the condition of obedience. Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1972, pp. 81 and 336-337. Another possibility is that a (priestly?) redactor wanted to portray Abraham as an obedient patriarch in the prophetic-priestly tradition: Abraham perceived God's revelation in respect to Sodom and Gomorrah and acted as a mediator and intercessor on behalf of those who unknowingly faced impending doom. See R. Lansing Hicks, "Abraham," IDB, vol. 1, p. 20; Samuel Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature, augmented edition, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971, pp. 177-179 (hereafter cited as Philo's Place in Judaism); Martin Buss, "Prophecy in Ancient Israel," IDBS, p. 694; Marks, "The Book of Genesis," Interpreter's 1 - Vol. Commentary, p. 17; cf., Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 270 and 325.

Martin Noth has pointed out that the Priestly tradition, especially the narrative portion, became the literary basis of the Pentateuchal narrative.[15] Further, R. Clements has indicated that P as the latest of the Pentateuchal sources attempts "to provide Israel with a renewed theological basis for its existence"[16] by reshaping the other major historical traditions so that the Abrahamic covenant became the "bedrock upon which all subsequent history rests."[17] It is probable that P provided an explanation for the temporary occupation of the land by the patriarchs by speaking of the "land of sojourning or land of temporary citizenship."[18]

---

[14] Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 21-22; Ronald Clements, Abraham and David: Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., 5, London: SCM Press, 1967, p. 74 (hereafter cited as Abraham and David). Against the thesis of Davies and Clements see Oswald T. Allis, Prophecy and the Church: An Examination of the Claim of Dispensationalists that the Christian Church is a Mystery Parenthesis which Interrupts the Fulfillment to Israel of the Kingdom Prophecies of the Old Testament, Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969, pp. 32-36 (hereafter cited as Prophecy and Church).

[15] Noth, Pentateuchal Traditions, pp. 11 and 239-247. Against the thesis of Noth see Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 324-325.

[16] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 70. Although Weinfeld agrees with Clements in respect to the dependence of the Abrahamic covenant in P on the Davidic covenant, Weinfeld insists that P does not reinterpret the Abrahamic covenant but simply follows the JE "tradition to which it is literally attached." "Covenant of Grant in O.T. and Near East," p. 202.

[17] Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 24.

[18] Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, p. 65; cf. Fowler, Building the Dispensations, pp. 65-68. The reason for the delay of the Israelite possession of the land is God's justice and patience in respect to the Amorites (Genesis 15:16). Zimmerli, O. T. and the World, p. 70. Later, the proclamation of Amos is that God will expel the Israelites for the very kind of reasons he expelled the Amorites (Amos 2:1-16).

Walter Brueggeman has pointed out that the historical situation to which P addressed itself was the exilic community -- a community without a land. Further, P not only endeavered to "legitimize cultic practices" which would better enable the displaced community to endure, but also sought to provide a theological basis for another occupation of the promised land.[19] The theme which runs throughout P, from beginning to end, is the promise and gift of the land to a landless people, Israel.

Beginning in the primeval account of creation, the theme is related to blessing in and occupation of land. The full formula of this theme is presented to Adam in Genesis 1:28:

> And God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.' (Genesis 1:28)

Afterward, this formula of blessing and control of the land is repeated at least in part, to Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, and the generation of Moses.[20]

R. Clements has demonstrated that P introduced an important change into the tradition of the Abrahamic covenant in order to heighten its promissory character and its unconditional permanence. In Genesis 17, P makes the promised land an everlasting possession. Further, Clements has argued that P's conviction of the permanent validity of the Davidic covenant both influenced P's reshaping of the Abrahamic covenant in this way and provided at the same time a more ancient and secure anchorage for the Davidic monarchy.[21]

---

[19] Brueggemann and Wolff, O. T. Traditions, 110.

[20] Ibid., pp. 103-108.

[21] Clements, Abraham and David, pp. 71-72. Note the addition of promised kings in Genesis 17:6 which points to the Davidic covenant. Davies goes too far when he concludes that "the possession of the land could never, for P, become conditioned on obedience to the Law; that election, resting upon the Abrahamic covenant, could not be annulled even by human disobedience." Gospel and Land, p. 22. In P's account of the covenant with Abraham there is a certain tension between undeserved election and obedience (Genesis 17:1). For a more cautious approach to the concept of obedience in P see Weinfeld's discussion of Leviticus 26. "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," pp. 188-189.

While the promise of the land is most prominent in the Abrahamic stories it nevertheless runs throughout the patriarchal narratives and serves to connect the patriarchs with the nation after it was settled in the land. It should be noted that the promise of the land is reiterated to Isaac (Genesis 26:3-4) and Jacob (Genesis 35:9-15). Further, though the Joseph narrative is greatly concerned with the theme of Joseph's rise to authority as governor over the land of Egypt, it is ultimately the land of promise and not the land of Egypt which remains the goal of the patriarchs and their descendants.[22] This is dramatically illustrated first by the burial of Jacob in the land of Canaan (Genesis 50:1-14; cf. 47:29-30), and then by the prophesied return of Joseph to the promised land (Genesis 48:21). For though Joseph is first buried in Egypt (Genesis 50:26), his final resting place was to be the promised land (Genesis 50:25, Exodus 13:19).

Though it is impossible to know with certainty in which groups and how early the tradition of the promised land was believed and passed on by the ancestors of Israel in the patriarchal period, Israel early became convinced that the land of Canaan which they eventually occupied or claimed as their own was in fact the land God promised to give to their ancestors and to them. Further, they were convinced that the gift of the land was secure in the unconditional covenant made with Abraham, and that they could look forward to the future, for God had promised to bless them in the land. Indeed, their optimism toward future blessing in the land rested on the assurance that blessing in the land was to be theirs forever -- an idea implicit in the Abrahamic covenant but made explicit much later by the P source. In fact, it is our proposition that this promise of the land unconditionally confirmed to the patriarchs in the Abrahamic covenant was the source of one of the two contradictory theological traditions which later collide in the prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology of Israel, and with which the early church had to come to terms.

---

[22] Brueggemann, The Land, p. 26; George W. Coats, From Canaan to Egypt, Washington D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976, pp. 1-4, 29, 32, 45, 49-50, 55-57, 74-79, 92.

CHAPTER 2

THE PROMISE OF THE LAND AND THE MOSAIC COVENANT

In chapter one, we discussed the tradition which presents the promise of the land as a gift unconditionally confirmed to the patriarchs and their descendants by God's oath in the covenant with Abraham. In fact, according to JEP, the history of Israel stands first under this patriarchal covenant which unconditionally promises Israel the land.[1] But there is another ancient tradition which associates the promise of the land with a different kind of covenant, the Mosaic covenant.

In contradistinction to the promissory type of covenant with Abraham, the Mosaic covenant is an obligatory type, in which the people, under threat of severe punishment, are pledged in loyalty to obey the commands of God because of his saving acts in their behalf.[2] Indeed, various scholars have drawn attention to the fact that the Mosaic covenant is modeled on the Hittite suzerain-vassal treaty of the second and first millenia B.C.[3] The basic common elements are: 1) The divine overlord's identification; 2) historical recital indicating the overlord's gracious acts; 3) stipulations of the treaty; f) innumeration of or invoking of divine witnesses; 5) blessings and curses; 6) recital of the treaty and deposition of the tablets of the treaty at the feet of the gods. It is generally recognized that though the Mosaic covenant in Exodus 19-24 is similar to this in structure, the clearest expression of similarity is the Mosaic covenant described in Deuteronomy, in which the land is perhaps the most important factor with respect to Yahweh's redemption of Israel as a nation.[4]

---

[1] Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, p. 69; Paul A. Riemann, "Covenant, Mosaic," IDBS, pp. 192-197.

[2] Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," IDBS, p. 189; idem, "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," p. 184; idem, "בְּרִית b^{e}rîth ," (hereafter cited as "b^{e}rîth "), Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, 2 vols., ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, trans. John T. Willis, rev. ed., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977, vol. 2, p. 274 (hereafter this dictionary cited as TDOT); von Rad, The Problem of the Hexateuch, p. 95; Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, p. 65.

[3] Delbert R. Hillers, Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969, pp. 68-70; George Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East, Pittsburg: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955, pp. 45 ff.; idem, Tenth Generation, pp. 132 ff.; McCarthy, O. T. Covenant: A Survey, pp. 71-72; Bustenay Oded, "Judah and the Exile" in Israelite and Judaean History, pp. 462-463 (hereafter cited as "Judah and Exile"); Weinfeld, "b^{e}rîth," pp. 273-276; Norbert Lohfink, "Deuteronomy," IDBS, p. 231.

The acquisition of and the possession of the land is a theme which runs throughout the laws and paraenetic discourse of Deuteronomy.[5] Just as in the historical prologue of the Hittite treaty, the suzerain designates the land to be taken and occupied by the vassal, so, in Deuteronomy, God tells Israel to go in and possess the land which is given to them (Deuteronomy 1:8 ff.; 3 and 19 ff.; 5:31 ff.; 12:1; 15:4; 19:2 ff.; 25:19, etc.). Two ideas are expressed here. First, the land has been given to Israel as a divine gift and second, the land must be entered and possessed by Israel's own efforts. Since, however, Yahweh gives the victory, human participation in the possession of the land is interpreted as a complementary action of believing obedience. Israel's first obligation in deference to the land, therefore, was to take possession of it.[6]

---

[4] In agreement with the position of von Rad, Patrick D. Miller, Jr. makes the following observation: "Any adequate treatment of the theology of Deuteronomy must ask about its understanding of the land and to the meaning of that understanding for the faith and life of Israel." "The Gift of God: the Deuteronomic Theology of the Land," Interpretation, 23, 1969, pp. 452 and 458 (hereafter cited as "The Gift of God"); von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 20 and 84-85; Leonhard Rost, Das Kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament, Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1965, pp. 14-16; cf. Hyatt, "Were There an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?", in Translating and Understanding the Old Testament, pp. 167-170; Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 129; Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, p. 315; Lohfink, "Deuteronomy," IDBS, p. 230.

[5] Miller, "The Gift of God," pp. 451-467; von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 26-33 and 94 ff.; Zimmerli, O. T. and the World, p. 77.

Unlike the Abrahamic covenant, in the Mosaic covenant, continued possession of the land is wholly contingent upon obedience to Yahweh and the law (Deuteronomy 16:20; 28:59 ff.). Indeed, an example of the tension between the Mosaic covenant and the Abrahamic covenant is the great speech of Moses in Deuteronomy 5:26 ff. Deuteronomy sets the historical situation of this event "on the other side of Jordan" at a point when Israel had the election of the promise but not the fulfillment of the promise.[7] While, in Deuteronomy the land is perhaps the most important factor in the survival of Yahweh's people, and salvation is inextricably associated with it, nevertheless, the great concern is that Israel might forfeit that salvation (possession of and blessing in the land) by its failure to fulfill the obligations of the Mosaic covenant.[8] For while Israel cannot attribute her original possession of the land to any merits of her own, her continued future in the land depends on her behavior in the land (Deuteronomy 5:31 ff.; 6:1 ff.; 8:1 ff.; 11:8 ff.; 12:1; 28:59 ff.).

---

[6] Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 59-64; Miller, "The Gift of God," p. 456.

Two theological perspectives are present in Deuteronomy and the Hexateuch as a whole. The first is the nomadic ideal represented by Abraham and the Levites who were not allowed to own a portion of the land. This may have influenced the Rechabites and Hosea. The second perspective is the "landed" people who were to enjoy the rest in the land by obeying the commandments of God. See Miller, "The Gift of God," pp. 461-462; Zimmerli, O. T. and the World, pp. 70-73.

An important point to note is that the promised land is first of all Yahweh's land (Leviticus 25:23). See von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 84-85; Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 66-67; Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 24-29. Magnus Ottoson emphasized this point so strongly that the concept of Canaan as Israel's inheritance is somewhat undermined. " ארץ 'erets, II. In the OT," (hereafter cited as "'erets in O. T."), TDOT, vol. 1, p. 401. Johannes Eichler pointed out that while it is true that the land is in an ultimate sense the land of Yahweh, the predominant idea is that "the land is Israel's heritage...promised by God to Abraham...." "Inheritance, Lot, Portion" The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., ed. Colin Brown, Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1975, vol. 1, p. 297 (hereafter this dictionary cited as New International Dictionary). A more balanced expression of the same concept is made by Juan I. Alfaro: "The land...is viewed in a double perspective in the bible: the land in relationship to God and the land in relationship to man...it belongs to Him...the land belongs to man..." "The Land--Stewardship," Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology, 8:2, 1978, p. 51.

[7] Gerhard von Rad, "Deuteronomy," IDB, vol. 1, p. 838; Lohfink, "Deuteronomy," IDBS, p. 232; Zimmerli, O. T. and World, p. 77; Jon Douglas Levenson, The Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48, Harvard Semitic Monograph Series, no. 10, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976, pp. 19 and 47-58 (hereafter cited as Program of Restoration). Weinfeld pointed out that the Deuteronomist links the concept of unconditionality to the Mosaic stipulations (Deuteronomy 28:25-28). "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," pp. 195-196; idem, Deuteronomy

We have, therefore, in the Mosaic covenant, the expression of the second theological tradition dealing with the promise of the land. Here, the promise of the land is a gift of God, but with a significant difference: continued possession of the gift of land is conditioned on obedience to the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant. It is this second way of understanding the promise of the land that later provides a basis for an eschatology (e.g. Jeremiah's) which endeavored to justify Israel's loss of the land in spite of the unconditional promise in the Abrahamic tradition -- which tradition became incorporated into and extended by the theology of the cult of the Jerusalem Temple.[9]

---

and the Deuteronomistic School, pp. 74-84. For a further discussion of the conditionality of the Davidic covenant see Aubrey R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955, pp. 20-21, 58, n. 4 (hereafter cited as Sacral Kingship).

[8] Miller, "The Gift of God," pp. 453-454 and 462-463; Mendenhall, Tenth Generation, p. 25; Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 129; de Vaux, Early History of Israel, pp. 451-452.

[9] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 80. For the importance of moving the ark to Jerusalem see Mayes, Period of the Judges, p. 107; Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 77-79. For the association of Mount Sinai and Mount Zion, Jerusalem, and the Temple see Jon Douglas Levenson, Program of Restoration, pp. 18-19. Richard J. Clifford made this same point: "This theophany language, at home in the traditions of Mount Sinai, was utilized in the Jerusalem cultus to impress upon the worshipper that the God of Sinai reveals himself anew on Mount Zion. Israel in the Temple liturgy relives the primal experience of Yahweh at Mount Sinai." The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972, p. 154 (hereafter cited as Cosmic Mountain). The concept of the "level ground" is the place God builds a new Temple in the Shepherd of Hermas (Similtude 9.10.1). This probably has a theological connection with the destruction of historic Jewish Temple. J. Ramsey Michaels, "The 'level ground' in the Shepherd of Hermas," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 59, 1968,

---

pp. 248-249. Samuel Krauss argued that originally Zion did not mean a barren place but a "delight" and Jerusalem meant the "foundation of a king called Shalem." "Zion and Jerusalem: A Linguistic and Historical Study," Palestinian Exploration Quarterly, 1945, pp. 31-33.

CHAPTER 3

THE PROMISE OF THE LAND AND THE DAVIDIC COVENANT

It is in the Davidic covenant as presented in the theology of the cult of the Jerusalem Temple that the unconditional nature of the promise to Abraham is reasserted. Moshe Weinfeld has demonstrated that the Davidic covenant follows the pattern of the Abrahamic one. Both are promissory, and like the gift of theland to Abraham, the gift of the house (dynasty) to David is unconditional. Further, like the gift of the land, the gift of the house was one of the most prominent gifts of the suzerain in the Hittite grants. Moreover, as is the case in the Hittite grants, the nation of Israel can rest secure, because the guarantee is that the promise to David is eternal. For though both the ruling prince and the nation may receive discipline, God's grace would not turn away from David -- the grace and the promise of a house would stand unconditionally (2 Samuel 7; Psalms 8:50; 89:33-37; 132:13-18). God has chosen Mount Zion as his dwelling place forever (Psalms 46; 48; 132:14).[1] In fact, the entirety of the land is epitomized in the temple on holy Mount Zion in the city of David; and it is through the Davidic king that the blessings originally promised to Abraham (Genesis 12:1-3) may be realized (Psalm 72:17).[2]

---

[1] Weinfeld, b^{e}rîth, TDOT, vol. 2, pp. 270-272; Weinfeld convincingly argued that the Deuteronomistic redactor placed the Davidic covenant and the sovereignty of the king under general obligations (1 Kings 2:4, 8:25, 9:4 ff.; Psalm 132:12 in contrast to Psalm 89:30-31 and 2 Samuel 7:14-15). "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," p. 195; idem, "Covenant, Davidic," IDBS, p. 191; idem Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, pp. 74-79. See the following: R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament, London: Oxford University Press, 1969, p. 41 (hereafter cited as New Temple); Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 86-93. Mowinkel, He That Cometh, pp. 96-97; Mendenhall, Tenth Generation, pp. 224 ff.

[2] McKelvey, New Temple, p. 3; Levenson, Program of Restoration pp. 10-12; David Noel Freedman, "Pentateuch," IDB, vol. 3, pp. 714-715; Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, p. 76. Clifford made the following observation: "The Solomon Temple reflects similar correspondence [the Canaanite high god dwelling in a temple or tent on the holy mountain], though the interpretation of individaual elements in the Temple remains difficult. In Psalm 48, the phrases of verses 1-3, 'his holy mountain,' 'the city of the great kind' [sic], and so on apply both to the mountain

It should be noted, however, that the historical relationship between the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants is not entirely clear. Ronald Clements, building on Alt's thesis, postulates that the close connection of David to Hebron, where the tradition of the Abrahamic covenant was prominent, makes it probable that the earlier Abrahamic tradition influenced the form of the Davidic covenant.[3] This would explain why both the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants are promissory in diametric opposition to the Mosaic covenant. Further, Clements suggests that the Yahwist saw the Abrahamic covenant as pointing forward to the rise of the Davidic Kingdom as possessor of the promised land.[4] After the transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem when David made the city his

---

of Yahweh and to Mount Zion. The Tent of Meeting, the predecessor of the Temple, is the earthly copy of the heavenly Tent of Meeting of the Divine Assembly of Canaanite religion." Cosmic Mountain, pp. 177-178.

[3] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 80; George Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine, The Biblical Archaeologist, 25, 1962, pp. 66 ff.; idem, Tenth Generation, pp. 182-183. There is a distinct possibility that the unconditionality of the promises to the patriarchs goes back to G. See also, J. J. M. Roberts, "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," Journal of Biblical Literature, 92, pp. 339 ff. (hereafter cited as "Davidic Origin of Zion Tradition"); Weinfeld, "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," p. 202; Islwyn Blythin, "The Patriarchs and the Promise," Scottish Journal of Theology, 21, 1968, pp. 66-63 (hereafter cited as "Patriarchs and Promise").

[4] Some scholars argue against the thesis that the Abrahamic covenant and the promise of the land is related to the time of David and Solomon. Their argument is that the Abrahamic tradition was given its basic shape as a unifying theology of identity on the brink of Israel's restoration from the Exile. See John Van Seters, Abraham in History and Tradition, London: Yale University Press, 1975, pp. 249-274 and p. 278; Jacob Hoftijzer, Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter, Leiden: Brill, 1956, pp. 26 ff. and 52 ff. For a criticism of Van Seters see W. Malcolm Clark (William G. Denver and W. Malcolm Clark), "The Patriarchal Tradition," pp. 147-148. For a criticism of Hoftijzer see White, "Divine Oath," pp. 174-175; Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 17, n. 14; and Blythin, "Patriarchal and Promise," p. 63. J. Philip Hyatt has argued that circumcision -- the sign of the covenant in P -- only assumed great significance for the Jews in the Exile. "Circumcision," IDB, vol. 1, p. 629. Against Hyatt's thesis see Weinfeld, "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," p. 203. See also Noth, Pentateuchal Traditions, pp. 38-41; Cross, Myth and Epic, p. 297.

capital, Jerusalem became the amphictyonic center and heir of the historic traditions. Later, these traditions were taken over by the temple as the single most articulate symbol of the actualization of the fulfillment of the promises and God's presence among his people. The Davidic covenant, the royal city, and finally the Temple not only came to centralize the focal point of the land-promise theme and all that it implied, but also became as it were a prism through which the promises to Abraham realized regal and international expression, especially in the empire of Solomon. In any event, as the popularity of the tradition of unconditional promise involved in the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants increased, so too did the tension between them and the Mosaic covenant, particularly with reference to Israel's future possession of and blessing in the land.[5]

To be sure, in spite of the tension, both traditions were genuine expressions of Israel's faith. The one emphasized the unconditional promise of the land and the kingdom, the other the obligations of the Mosaic covenant. Further, both traditions allowed for severe discipline in the event the nation should sin. The question, however, was whether or not this discipline could result in expulsion from the land and the loss of the monarchy. This, in fact, was answered in different ways in the pre-exilic prophets and writings.[6]

---

[5] Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 165; Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," IDBS, p. 189, sec. 1, par. 3. McKelvey's comment in respect to the JE (G) traditions merits repeating: "...David had the ark transferred to Jerusalem when he made the city his capital. The action was of incalculable significance. Jerusalem now became the amphictyonic centre and heir of Israel's historic traditions." New Temple, p. 4. For the contribution of P in respect to kingship and the promise to Abraham see Levenson, Program of Restoration, p. 97. For the blending of the Zion and Davidic traditions see Roberts, "Davidic Origin of Zion Tradition," pp. 341-342; von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, p. 72; pp. 19-59; Jared Judd Jackson, "The Ark Narratives: An Historical, Textual, and Form-Critical Study of I Samuel 4-6 and II Samuel 6," unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York, reprint at the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1962, pp. 325-326 (hereafter cited as "The Ark Narratives").

[6] For an excellent review of the interpretation of the prophets see Ronald E. Clements, One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956, pp. 51-75 (hereafter cited as Old Testament Interpretation). In recent years, redaction criticism,

Some saw the future of the nation in terms of the Mosaic covenant. Israel was regarded as having broken the covenant significantly and therefore deserving of the covenant curses and expulsion from the land. One example is Amos. In his proclamation, Amos clearly was aware of the election of Israel and the intervention of Yahweh to give them the land (Amos 2:9-10; 3:2). Yet, these traditions are used solely by Amos to establish the guilt of Israel and to explain why the inevitable judgment of Yahweh must come (Amos 3:2, 8:2). Further, Amos attacked the popular notion of the election tradition as it regarded the Day of Yahweh. No longer would that day be a day of salvation. Rather it would be a day of darkness and not light (Amos 5:20).[7] Even the remnant motif in Amos is presented in bitter irony. Surely, there would be a remnant, but that remnant would be of no consequence for Israel as a nation (Amos 3:12; 4:1-3; 6:9-10; cf. Micah 2:1-2; 3:1-4; 6:1-8).[8] But

---

form criticism, and traditio-historical criticism have shown that the prophets to a greater degree than previously realized "have their roots in the basic sacral traditions of the early period." Gerhard von Rad, The Message of the Prophets, rev. Gerhard von Rad and Eduard Haller, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, New York, Hagertown, San Francisco, and London: Harper and Row, 1967, p. 11 (hereafter cited as Message of the Prophets); Ronald Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975, pp. 1-7, 86-92.

[7] Artur Weiser, Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten, Alte Testament Deutsch Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk, 24, 2d ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955, pp. 159-163; Richard Cripps, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos, 2d ed., London: SPCK, 1960, pp. 66 ff. and p. 190; Georg Fohrer, "Remarks on Modern Interpretation of the Prophets," Journal of Biblical Literature, 80, p. 315; Hans W. Wolff, Amos the Prophet: The Man and His Background, trans. Foster R. McCurley, ed. with introduction John Reumann, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973, pp. 85-89; Bright, History of Israel, p. 260; George A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Expositors Bible: The Minor Prophets, New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1903, pp. 168-169.

[8] For a more moderate view generally represented by more recent evaluations that recognize the theme of hope in Amos see the following: Bright (who apparently modified his view expressed in History of Israel), Covenant and Promise, p. 86; Hasel, The Remnant, p. 203; Bernhard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, 3d ed., Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975, p. 19; James D. Smart, "Amos," IDB, vol. 1, p. 20; James M. Ward, "Amos," IDBS, p. 23; von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 108-109; Ronald Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, London: SCM Press, 1965, p. 49, n. 11 and 111-112; idem, The Conscience of the Nation: A Study of Early Israelite Prophecy, London: Oxford University Press,

this was not the only way of interpreting Israel's future in the land in terms of the Mosaic covenant.

Unlike Amos who used the election traditions to establish the guilt of Israel and provide a basis for imminent judgment, Hosea perceived the traditions as a model through which God would deal with Israel.[9] Hosea declared that the imminent judgment and exile of Israel would be a return to captivity as in the captivity in Egypt (Hosea 7:16; 8:13; 9:3, 6, 17; 11:5).[10] Further, Hosea announced that Yahweh would bring Israel again into the wilderness so that Israel could again turn her thoughts to Yahweh, renew the covenant and receive the land of promise (Hosea 2:14-23).[11] It is, according to Hosea, precisely because God will

---

1967, pp. 42-43 (hereafter cited as Conscience of the Nation); Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 40, n. 5; Zimmerli, Man and Hope, p. 90. Clements, in his earlier works, expressed a cautious possibility of the theme of hope in Amos. In his most recent study of the prophets he recognized this theme in Amos. Yet he does not clarify his own position in respect to the crucial passages as the genuine utterances of Amos. Prophecy and Tradition, pp. 44 ff.

Perhaps Hans Walter Wolff represents the most striking example in perceiving the themes of both doom and hope in Amos. Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos, trans. Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr., and Charles A. Muenchow, ed. S. Dean McBride, Jr., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977 (hereafter the references in this note are to this work). Wolff still maintained that 5:14-15 was a sapiential interpolation (p. 250). Wolff, however, saw the prospect of hope in 5:4, although this hopeful prospect yields to the warning in vs. 5 (pp. 237-239). Wolff even thought it probable that 9:11 was a genuine utterance of Amos (p. 352).

[9] James M. Ward, "The Message of the Prophet Hosea," Interpretation, 23, 1969, pp. 388-389 (hereafter cited as "Message of Hosea"); idem, "Hosea," IDBS, p. 421; von Rad, Message of the Prophets, p. 111; Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 93.

[10] Ward singles out "two foci of Hosea's ethical indictment...the sacrificial cult and kingship...(Hosea 9:9 f., 15; 10:9; 11:2; 13:6)..." "Message of Hosea," p. 390; cf. 391. See also Noth, The History of Israel, p. 230.

[11] As Weinfeld pointed out, the punishment for disobedience in Deuteronomy 28:25-28 is a return to "Egypt." "Covenant of Grant in O. T. and Near East," pp. 195-196. This was apparently the principle Hosea used in his pronouncement of judgment (Hosea 2:14; 7:16; 8:3; 9:3, 6, 17). See Ward, "Message of Hosea," p. 391. Perhaps because of "apparent forgiveness and rehabilitation" of his wife, Hosea looked to the

love Israel spontaneously that he will effect the restoration of Israel to the land, and bless Israel there (Hosea 11; 14:4). Indeed, Hosea proclaims that in the very face of Israel's insolence, Yahweh as sovereign can graciously respond from his love (Hosea 11:8-9). For Hosea, Israel's hope and restoration to the land of promise lay not in any unconditional promise but in Yahweh's ability to love freely, and with that Hosea remains faithful to the saving history remembered in the election traditions.[12]

Another way of understanding Israel's future in the land, however, was rooted in the Davidic tradition of unconditional promises. There might be severe discipline for Israel, but the nation would survive in the land, even if there were only a remnant left. Perhaps the best example of this position is Isaiah.

Isaiah, especially in his early ministry, proclaimed the unconditional destruction of the northern and southern kingdoms. But this was not the extent of his proclamation. Isaiah was deeply tied to the Davidic traditions developed in Jerusalem, and asserted that ultimately Yahweh would restore the glories of the city and its kingdom through a righteous and faithful remnant. Indeed, Jerusalem was founded by Yahweh (Isaiah 14:32), and Mount Zion was the place of Yahweh's name (Isaiah 18:7). Surely, a remnant would return to Yahweh (Isaiah 10:20-23).[13]

---

wilderness period as a time of hopeful national repentance. Bright, History of Israel, p. 260. See also Zimmerli, Man and Hope, pp. 91, 93; Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 41. Against Bright's interpretation of Hosea's marriage see Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, p. 29.

[12] Hans Walter Wolff, Hosea, trans. Gary Stansell, ed. Paul D. Hanson, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974, pp. xxviii-xxix; von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 115-116; Zimmerli, Man and Hope, p. 92; Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, pp. 44-46.

[13] Zimmerli, Man and Hope, pp. 95-105; idem "Hope in the OT," IDBS, p. 419, sec. b; James M. Ward, "Isaiah," IDBS, p. 457 sec. 2, b; Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 42-44; Sigmund Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition, Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1946, pp. 75-76 (hereafter cited as Prophecy and Tradition);idem, He That Cometh, pp. 61-80; von Rad, Message of the Prophets, p. 122; Clements accepts as "plausible enough" Mowinckel's argument that the blessing and cursing formulas in the Psalms are derived from ancient formulations made by

UMI

Though it is debated among scholars whether or not the aspect of promise was present in Isaiah's early ministry, recent studies by Gerhard Hasel and James Ward have suggested that from Isaiah's call this motif was present. Following Isaiah's question of "How long, O Lord" in response to the announced judgment of God on Israel, the answer of the Lord is that a radical purge would be absolutely necessary before the remnant as a holy seed could begin to develop into a new and restored people of God. This very motif may be that reflected in Isaiah 1:24-31.[14]

Further, the messianic announcement in Isaiah 9:6-7 is rooted in the Davidic tradition of unconditional promise, and presupposes the restoration of the promised land.[15] As has been indicated previously in our discussion, the promises to Abraham were largely subsumed in the Davidic covenant, where they realized their greatest fulfillment in the empire of Solomon. It is in this tradition that Isaiah finds his fundamental assurance of ultimate hope for Israel's future in the land -- a future as the kingdom through which others were to be blessed.

Israel's future in the promised land, therefore, was presented in terms of two traditions. One tradition emphasized the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant. The other tradition was deeply tied to the promis-

---

seers such as Balaam. Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, p. 18; Sigmund Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, 2 vols., trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962, vol. 2., pp. 44-52 (hereafter cited as Psalms in Israel's Worship). This would indicate that both the themes of blessing and cursing -- of hope and doom -- could have been a traditional tension in the religion of Israel. See also Clifford, Cosmic Mountain, pp. 156 ff.

[14] Ward, "Isaiah," IDBS, p. 458, sec. 2, e; Hasel argued that the textual evidence is very strong for the last three words of Isaiah 6:13. He further pointed out that the remnant motif present in other ancient near eastern societies shows great reason to believe the motifs of both doom and hope were present in Isaiah from the beginning. The Remnant, pp. 237, n. 86, 382. Bright makes the same point in terms of the Davidic and Mosaic traditions in tension in Isaiah. Covenant and Promise, p. 103. See also Christopher R. North, "Isaiah," IDB, vol. 2, p. 735, sec. 1, b. See also von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 127-131.

[15] Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 43.

sory Davidic covenant. Further, both of these views seemed valid. On the one hand, there had been the assertion that northern Israel, because of her flagrant disobedience to the Mosaic covenant, would be destroyed. This, in fact, happened. On the other hand, there had been the proclamation, rooted in the traditions of the Davidic covenant, that although the southern kingdom would experience severe punishment for her sins, nevertheless, the kingdom would stand. And this also happened.

During the seventh century B.C., because of the political vicissitudes, the importation of and the influence of the theological bias of the northern kingdom occurred in the southern kingdom. There was an earnest endeavor of some to bring about religious reform. The tradition which emphasized the stipulation of the Mosaic covenant, at first largely dominant in the northern kingdom, became the dominant although short lived view in the southern kingdom.[16] This was most evident in the reform of Josiah; and Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic history are the clearest expressions of its theology.

After the fall of the northern kingdom, Deuteronomy, along with other northern theological material, was brought to Jerusalem and reworked there.[17] As we have already indicated in chapter two, Deuteronomy placed Israel's existence in the promised land under the obligations of the Mosaic covenant. Further, the northern bias against the Davidic traditions, especially as a result of the kingship of Solomon, was articulated in such a way as to place the monarchy under the conditions of the covenant (Deuteronomy 17:14-20). It should be noted, however, that rather than completely undermining the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants altogether, Deuteronomy may be viewed as an effort to work out a coherent relationship between the promissory covenants and the Mosaic covenant by which Israel was to live in the land (e.g., Deuteronomy 5:2-3; 8:1). For the patriarchal covenant of promise is appealed to in order to affirm Israel's entitlement to the promised land (Deuteronomy 6:10; 7:12; 8:18; 9:5; 11:9). In this way,

---

[16] Bustenay Oded, "Judah and Exile," in Israelite and Judaean History, pp. 460-469; Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp. 127 ff.

[17] Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, initiated by Ernst Sellin, trans. David E. Green, Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1968, pp. 177-178.

Deuteronomy maintains a certain tension between promise and fulfillment, for Deuteronomy threatens the possibility of expulsion from the land in spite of the promise to the patriarchs (Deuteronomy 8:11 ff.). If expulsion from the land should occur, however, the promise to Abraham would remain a ground for ultimate hope (compare Deuteronomy 9:24-29).[18]

An even clearer expression of this kind of theology and its reserve about the unconditionality of the promissory covenant is the Deuteronomistic history, a massive historical unity, extending from the introduction of the original book of Deuteronomy through 2 Kings. Through this material runs a theological commentary portraying the history of Yahweh's dealing with Israel as his people in terms of rebellion and forgiveness -- obedience to the law as the means to receive the promises of God. The first part portrays Israel's acceptance of the law, homiletically expanded to include blessing and curse, as a basis for the conquest and occupation of the promised land. The second part of the work (Judges - 1 Samuel 7) follows a repeated pattern of rebellion and forgiveness, in the Judges' stories, to the origin of the monarchy, a more stable form of government through which the Mosaic law may be maintained. The third part of the work (1 Samuel 7 - 1 Kings 8) traces the rise of the united monarchy and its glory. The final part of the history (1 Kings 9 - 2 Kings 25) traces the pattern of rebellion and forgiveness in the decline of the divided monarchy.[19]

There are many passages through the Deuteronomistic history which indicate that the promises in the Davidic tradition could not be without qualification. Some passages indicate obedience as a necessary condition for possession of the land (Deuteronomy 1:34-30; 4:25-31; 30:15-20; compare Genesis 18:19 which is probably an addition of the Deuteronomistic Corpus). In other passages, the promises to David and his royal seed require obedience to the Mosaic covenant (1 Samuel 12:13-15;

---

[18] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 65; Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 21.

[19] (Wolff), Brueggemann and Wolff, O. T. Traditions, p. 83. David Freedman argued for three editors or editorial circles. "Deuteronomic History," IDBS, p. 226. F. M. Cross argued for two editors. Myth and Epic, pp. 274-289.

1 Kings 2:1-4; 6:12-13; cf. Psalms 132:12). Indeed, there are many passages in the Deuteronomistic history which reflect the theme that obedience to this covenant is the condition for blessing in the land (Deuteronomy 4:29-31; Judges 2:7-22; 1 Samuel 7:3; 2 Kings 17:13; and especially 1 Kings 8:46-50).

The theology of the reform, then, in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history, placed the promissory covenants under the obligations of the Mosaic covenant. During the reign of Josiah this way of understanding Israel's future in the land prevailed in the southern kingdom; but after the sudden death of Josiah, for whatever reasons, the theology of the Davidic covenant as understood in the cult of the Jerusalem Temple reasserted itself.[20] In spite of imminent national disaster, and with perhaps only formal observance of the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant, the official theology expected Yahweh's unconditional protection of the nation because of the election of David and Zion.[21] It is with this view of absolute assurance that Jeremiah collided, and because of the nation's sins proclaimed the judgment

---

[20] (Wolff) Brueggemann and Wolff, O. T. Traditions, pp. 83-100; Cross, Myth and Epic, p. 284; Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 137; Aubrey R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 1-21, 127-134; Noth, The History of Israel, p. 277f.

[21] J. Alberto Soggin, "The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom," in Israelite and Judaean History, p. 373; Bright, History of Israel, p. 287; J. J. M. Roberts, "Zion Tradition," IDBS, pp. 986-987, sec. 4; Claus Westermann indicated that the specific "Royal Psalms" are Psalms 2; 18; 20; 21; 45; 72; (89); 101; 110; (132); 144. "Psalms, Book of," IDBS, p. 708, sec. 1, d. In addition to these, the Psalms or portions of the Psalms which clearly reflect the Davidic-Zionic traditions are 46:1-4; 47:2-3, 7; 48:1-3; 76:2. Verses which indicate the Davidic-Zionic tradition will endure forever are Psalms 18:50; 89:3-5; and 132:13-14, although a condition of obedience on the part of the Davidic ruler is in 132:12. For a discussion of these Psalms both before and after the reform of Josiah see the following: von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 126-144; Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp. 59-67; Crim, Royal Psalms, pp. 50-127; (for Psalm 89:3-5), Diethlem Michel, Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen, Abhandlungen zur Evangelischen Theologie, vol. 1, Bonn: H. Bouvier u. Co., Verlag, 1960, p. 93; Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 1-134; Mowinckel, Psalms in Israel's Worship, pp. 61-73, 89-90, 98-101; Clifford, Cosmic Mountain, pp. 140-155; Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., The Psalms in Christian Worship: A Practical Guide, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976, pp. 17-18. See also the pertinent sections especially in respect to Psalm 110:2 (vol. 3, p. 115), in the translation and commentary of Mitchell Dahood, Psalms I, II, III, The Anchor Bible, Garden City: Doubleday and Co., (I) 1966, (II) 1968, (III), 1970.

UMI

called for in the Mosaic covenant.

The prophecies of Jeremiah and the subsequent opposition by the spokesmen of the official court theology in the fourth year of the reign of Zedekiah dramatically illustrate the eventual collision of these two ancient and, to a large extent, contradictory theological traditions in the faith of Israel. In 594 B. C., Jeremiah, convinced that Israel's response to the reform of Josiah was but superficial (Jeremiah 4:3 ff.; 8:4-7), prophesied the doom of Judah (Jeremiah 27), and, bound in the wooden yoke bars of an ox, graphically demonstrated the coming subjugation of the nation to Babylon (Jeremiah 28). But Jeremiah's position did not go unopposed. Another prophet, aligned with the majority opinion, Hananiah the son of Azzur, stood toe to toe with the prophet from Anathoth, took the yoke bars from his neck, broke them in pieces, and declared that thus would Yahweh break the yoke of Babylon within two years. Jeremiah left. But Hananiah did not have the last word. Later, Jeremiah, convinced that his own position was, in fact, the word of Yahweh, again confronted Hananiah, denounced him as a false prophet and insisted that the Babylonian yoke would not be of wood but of iron![22]

It seems clear that both prophets were firm in their convictions. On the one hand, Hananiah, together with the majority of the priests and prophets associated with the official court, was certain that a prophecy against the city of Jerusalem -- the home of the Temple in which Yahweh caused his Name to dwell -- could not be the word of Yahweh (Jeremiah 26:7 ff.). On the other hand, Jeremiah was absolutely certain that destruction was coming in spite of whatever theology lay behind the majority's convictions (Jeremiah 4:1-2; 21:12; 22:30). Indeed, it was because of these two contradictory theological traditions concerning Israel and the promised land that there were, on the one hand, an adamant refusal of the majority to anticipate anything but deliverance in the teeth of such peril, and, on the other hand, the conviction of the prophet Jeremiah that although there may be hope in the distant future

---

[22] Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 205-206; Stanley Brice Frost, "The Book of Jeremiah" in Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 391.

(e.g. Jeremiah 32), nevertheless Judah's impending doom was sure.[23]

It ought to be noted, however, that although Jeremiah viewed Israel's immediate future in terms of the judgments expressed in the Mosaic covenant, there is present in his proclamation the idea of the restoration of a repentant and obedient Israel to the promised land. Early in his ministry, where Jeremiah pronounces judgment on the community for its false trust in the Temple, a restoration to the land is considered possible if the people will obey Yahweh and return to him. Such a hope of restoration to the land is given considerable attention in the poetic material in chapters 30-31. Finally, the action of Jeremiah to redeem a piece of family land is symbolic of Israel's restoration and future occupation of the land.[24]

Thus far, in the first three chapters, we have examined Israel's concept of her future in the land in terms of promise and fulfillment. While it is true that Israel did not have an eschatology in the proper sense of the word before the classical prophets of the eighth century, Israel's beliefs about her future from a very early period -- perhaps even from the very beginning -- were oriented toward hope and blessing in terms of promise and fulfillment. Indeed, in contrast to the nature and fertility myths of the Canaanites, the disparate group of Hebrew settlers which later became identified as Israel, interpreted their history as a series of epic events in which their God led them from early promise to later fulfillment:

> The various events of Israel's past are thus not seen as disconnected episodes, but rather as a chain leading from an early promise to a later fulfillment. And this chain comes to replace the primordial adventures of the gods of Canaan as the drama celebrated in Israel's cultic ritual, for the patron god Yahweh was confessed in Israel's premonarchical cult centers to be the god who had

---

[23] Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp. 144-145; Frost, "The Book of Jeremiah" in Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, pp. 374-375; Zimmerli, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 201-204.

[24] Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 43-44; von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 166 ff.; William L. Holiday, "Jeremiah," IDBS, pp. 470-472; Zimmerli, "Hope in OT," IDBS, p. 419, sec. 3, b; idem, O. T. Theology in Outline, pp. 67, 204.

> given Israel's patriarchs the promise of a land to live in as a part of his covenant with them. The cultic confession went on to trace that promise through its various stages down to its fulfillment.[25]

Thus, the story presented in the Hexateuch reveals how God called Abraham, promised him a son, blessing, and land; how he renewed these promises with Abraham's descendants who were eventually and miraculously delivered from bondage in Egypt. Further, God covenanted with the Israelites at Sinai and gave them the Law; then, after leading the people through the wilderness, he brought them into the promised land.

Behind this story of God's election of and relationship to Israel, particularly as these relate to the land, stand two different traditions. First, there is the promise to Abraham and the patriarchs, epitomized in the promissory covenant in Genesis 15. Later P introduced a significant change into the tradition of the Abrahamic covenant in order to heighten its promissory character and its unconditional permanence. In Genesis 17, P makes the promised land an "everlasting possession." Further, P's conviction of the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant both influenced P's reshaping of the Abrahamic covenant in this way and provided at the same time a more ancient and secure anchorage for the Davidic dynasty. Not only Abraham but his descendants have been promised the land as an everlasting inheritance.

Second, there is, in a theological sense, the constitutive event of the exodus resulting in the obligatory Mosaic covenant. Deuteronomy is the clearest expression of this. Further, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history subject the promissory covenants to the obligations of the Mosaic covenant. The theological view in this material admitted no unconditional promise of land or dynasty; though the promises to Abraham and David might be grounds for ultimate hope, blessing in the land was made subject to the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant.

These two types of covenants, then, are in diametric opposition to each other. Further, they represent at least two different traditions which were later blended together, after those who had participated in the exodus and worshipped Yahweh in the wilderness were integrated with those Hebrews in Palestine. Yet, each tradition provided a substantially different way of viewing Israel's future in the land as evidenced in the pre-exilic prophets and writings.[26]

---

[25] Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975, p. 14 (hereafter cited as Dawn of Apocalyptic). See also Williams, "Eschatology," NCE, p. 525, sec. entitled 'Preprophetic Origins.'

Moreover, in the pre-exilic prophets and writings both ways of viewing Israel's future in the land were integrated with the visionary element of whichever theological perspective was advanced, and pragmatically translated in terms of real history. The visionary element of the prophet or theologian was securely anchored in terms of real enemies, places, and events. With the collapse of the Davidic monarchy, the destruction of the Temple, and the reality of exile there were no longer the historical realities of these two traditions into which the prophet or theologian could translate the elements of God's will for the nation. It is at this point we enter a period of transition from prophetic to apocalyptic eschatology, and ultimately apocalypticism.

---

[26] Cf. Michael D. Guinan, Covenant in the Old Testament, Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1975, pp. 8, 11, 13-14, 27-30, 42-44.

CHAPTER 4

THE PROMISE OF THE LAND FROM THE EXILE TO THE EARLIER LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The promise of blessing in the land as Israel's heritage provided the basis of Israel's hope in the future. This concept demonstrated Israel's conviction that God desired to give his people a secure place for blessing in history. Further, Israel's pre-exilic eschatology, which had its roots in this concept, maintained in different ways that ultimately God would fulfill his promise to Israel: God would restore the land as Israel's promised inheritance.

With the exile and the loss of the historical realities such as monarchy and the temple in which the fulfillment of the promises was expressed, however, the hope of attaining blessing in the land gradually began to be expressed through the religious perspective of apocalyptic eschatology. The elect, having experienced national disintegration and alienation to a significant degree began to adopt the perspective of apocalyptic eschatology which offered a means of resolution between the stark realities of exile and the promise of blessing and salvation in the land. This new perspective, which increasingly utilized the visions and motifs of ancient myth, provided a context out of which, later, apocalypticism could develop. Moreover, it was in the literature of apocalypticism that the hope of attaining the promise of blessing in the land was expressed in mythic terms largely divorced from real history. In apocalypticism, Yahweh and/or his Messiah himself, as the Divine Warrior would restore the land as Israel's promised inheritance; and this action would either inaugurate or accompany the New Age.[1]

---

[1] R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity: or Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from Pre-Prophetic Times Till the Close of the New Testament Canon, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899, pp. 82-120 (hereafter cited by the popular designation Eschatology); Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 133 ff.; Martin Rist, "Apocalypticism," IDB, vol. 1, p. 159, sec. 2, c.; D. S. Russell, Between the Testaments, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1960, pp. 99-156; idem, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 B.C.--A.D. 100: The Westminster Press, 1964, pp. 285-385; Joshua Block, On the Apocalyptic in Judaism, Jewish Quarterly

Paul Hanson, in his studies of the historical and sociological origins of Jewish apocalypticism, concluded that the use of formal lists to define and distinguish apocalyptic material from eschatological material was inadequate. In his attempt to determine the difference between eschatological and apocalyptic material, he perceived three distinct areas: prophetic eschatology, apocalyptic eschatology, and finally, apocalypticism. Hanson's understanding of the terms are for the most part, both insightful and helpful. Because of this, we choose to adopt his definitions for our discussion of the concept of the promised land. Hanson's definitions of prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology are as follows:

> 1. Prophetic Eschatology we define as a religious perspective which focuses on the prophetic announcement to the nation of the divine plans for Israel and the world which the prophet has witnessed unfolding inthe divine council and which he translates into the terms of plain history, real politics, and human instrumentality; that is, the prophet interprets for the king and the people how the plans of the divine council will be effected within the context of their nation's history and the history of the world.
>
> 2. Apocalyptic eschatology we define as a religious perspective which focuses on the disclosure (usually esoteric in nature) to the elect of the cosmic vision of Yahweh's sovereignty -- especially as it relates to his acting to deliver his faithful -- which disclosure the visionaries have largely ceased to translate into the terms of plain history,

---

Review Monograph Series 2, Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952, pp. 86-89 (hereafter cited as Apocalyptic in Judaism); H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation, rev. ed., New York: Association Press, 1964, pp. 13-166; Williams, "Eschatology," NEC, p. 527; Norman Cohn The Pursuit of the Millenium: Revolutionary Millinarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages, rev. and expanded ed., London: Temple Smith, 1970, pp. 19-21 (hereafter cited as Pursuit of Millenium). For the hypothesis that the roots of apocalyptic are in the wisdom tradition see von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 271-274. For a new approach to the origins of apocalyptic reaching back to prophetic eschatology see Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 91-111, 343-346, Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 1-31, 280-401; idem, "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern," Journal of Biblical Literature, 92, 1973, p. 43 n. 19 (hereafter cited as "Zech. 9 and Ritual Pattern").

> real politics, and human instrumentality due to a pessimistic view of reality growing out of the bleak post-exilic conditions within which those associated with the visionaries found themselves. Those conditions seemed unsuitable to them as a context for the envisioned restoration of Yahweh's people.[2]

It should be emphasized, however, that although the forms of prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology are different, the hope of restored blessing in a glorified land is essential and common to both. Further, it is this common element which provided an unbroken line between prophetic eschatology and apocalypticism. Hanson argues that this can be traced through the development of apocalyptic eschatology which began in the sixth century B. C. Indeed, apocalypticism is latent in apocalyptic eschatology.[3]

---

[2] Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 11; idem, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment," Revue Biblique, 78, 1971, pp. 31-38. There has been no general consensus of opinion concerning the definition of apocalyptic. See von Rad, Message of the Prophets, p. 27; Colin Brown, ed., "Glossary," New International Dictionary, vol. 1, pp. 50, 52, 56.

[3] Hanson, "Zech. 9 and Ritual Pattern," pp. 37-39, 58-59; idem, Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 348-349; idem, "Apocalypticism," IDBS, pp. 31-32. Robert M. Grant advanced a different thesis for the origins of apocalyptic. He argued that after the Maccabean wars, apocalyptic grew out of prophecy. See Gnosticism and Early Christianity, 2 d. ed., New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966, pp. 27 ff.

Klaus Koch made a rather thorough evaluation of the previous approaches to apocalyptic and proposed that further research and new answers were required. The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Negative Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d. ser., 22, trans. Margaret Kohl, Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1970. For a rather recent approach that differs from Hanson's see William Sanford LaSor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972, p. 99 (hereafter cited as Scrolls and New Testament). For a rejection of Hanson's thesis (as presented in "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," Interpretation, 25, 1971, p. 459) see Leon Morris, Apocalyptic, 2 d. rev. ed., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972, p. 29. For those who have approaches similar to Hanson's see Frank M. Cross, Myth and Epic, p. 343; R. G. Hammerton-Kelly, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic," Vetus Testamentum, 20, 1970, pp. 4-10 (hereafter cited as "Temple and Apocalyptic"). We have adopted Hanson's approach to the origins and purpose of apocalyptic as a positive contribution that helps clarify the frustrating situation outlined by Koch.

Whenever a group experienced significant alienation in the religious and political experience of Israel, apocalypticism could emerge as a symbolic universe in which the alienated group could maintain its identity and interpret the past, present and future in a way that would explain how the elect would eventually be delivered and how the wicked would eventually be punished. Moreover, in the mythic imagery of apocalyptic, there is a radical new utilization of temporal and spatial categories so that the blessings in the new age are expressed in greater and more cosmic dimensions. When this kind of apocalyptic experimentation was applied to the inheritance of blessing in the land, a new dimension of meaning could emerge.[4] Although something as singular as the city of Jerusalem or the Temple could epitomize the land of promised blessing, through the cosmic imagery of apocalyptic eschatology and apocalypticism, the promised land could transcend the boundaries of Canaan and be instead a promised new world of blessing.[5]

---

[4] Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 1-31, 126-134, 201; Brueggemann, The Land, p. 165; Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 334 ff.

[5] Hanson made this point clear: "As underscored by [Isaiah] 65:17 ff., the break between the old era of evil and the new era of blessing will be radical. Thus we notice here the same movement away from an eschatology firmly related to historical events toward an apocalyptic view emancipated from the restraints of historical contingencies. The new heavens and new earth of chapter 65 are equivalent to the 'land which is to be born in a day,' and the 'nation brought forth in a moment.'" Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 183.

The dimensions of Canaan are important for this study especially in respect to some of the pseudepigraphical books of the Old Covenant, Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and later Christian concepts concerning the land-promise theme. According to the biblical record the boundaries of Canaan varied.

DeVaux made an interesting point when he proposed that the land of Canaan never extended east of the Jordan. In fact, the entry into the promised land of Canaan occurs by means of crossing westward through the Jordan (Numbers 33:51; 34:2; 35:10; cf. Deuteronomy 32:49; Joshua 5:12). "Only one text -- Genesis 50:10-11 -- is an exception to this general rule..." [and]..."can...be explained as an attempt to include a tradition which deviated from the norm, that of the tomb of Jacob situated in Transjordania." Early History of Israel, p. 129 and pp. 129-132. The boundaries of the land are defined in a loose manner in Deuteronomy 11:24 and Joshua 1:2-4: "every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon." See Zimmerli, O. T. and the World, pp. 69-70. Davies indicated the largest area historically controlled by Israel (Exodus 23:31 ff.). Gospel and Land, p. 16, n. 3, a.

It would seem possible that the very general language of Genesis

In the post-exilic prophets and writings, the hope for the inheritance of the promised land is maintained.[6] In Ezekiel, we encounter the same irresponsible concept of land possession that Jeremiah rejected. Some believed that because they were the descendants of Abraham they were therefore heirs of the land as their promised inheritance. Here, too, this concept is rejected (33:24), but the hope of inheritance and spiritual renewal is affirmed. Yahweh, the city, and the temple would be restored in the land (43:1-5; 44:4; 48:35). The people would receive the land as their restored inheritance. The description of the reappropriation of the land is reminiscent of the division of the land under Joshua 13-19 (36:1 ff.; 47:13-48:29). The promise of restoration to the land is combined with the covenantal formula "I will be your God." Spiritual renewal and blessing in the land belong together. Finally, it should be noted that Ezekiel combines the concepts of Paradise and the promised land (28; 31; 47).[7]

The concept of the restoration of the promised land and blessing is a significant theme in Second Isaiah. The land would be reallocated as Israel's inheritance (49:7-9). The tradition of the promise to Abraham provided a basis for Yahweh's intention to do this. Just as Yahweh called and blessed Abraham, he would comfort and restore Zion (51:2-3). Further, though exilic Zion was then as barren as Sarah had been, God would cause her descendants to possess not just her historic boundaries, but the nation's (54:1-3). Through the cosmic imagery of

---

13:14-17 provided a basis for later apocalyptic visionaries to describe the extent of the promised land in terms which considerably transcended the varying historical boundaries. John H. Marks pointed out that "the view from Bethel does not provide a panoramic propsect of Palestine." "Book of Genesis," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 13. It is improbable, however, that this would have carried much weight with an apocalyptic visionary.

[6] Otto J. Baab, "Inheritance," IDB, vol. 2, p. 702, sec. 4; Paul L. Hammer, "Inheritance in the NT," IDBS, p. 428; Eichler, "Inheritance, Lot, Portion," New International Dictionary, p. 297.

[7] Brueggemann, The Land, pp. 137 ff.; Levenson, Program of Restoration, pp. 25-39, 111-128; Walter Zimmerli, "The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel," Interpretation, 23, 1969, p. 138; idem, "Ezekiel," IDBS, p. 316, sec. 4, para. 3. Bustanay Oded suggested the reasons why Israel survived the exile and maintained her theological hopes. See "Judah and Exile," in Israelite and Judaean History, p. 484.

apocalyptic eschatology, the promise of blessing in the land would transcend the normal boundaries, for God is the God of the whole earth (54:5). This would be the inheritance of the elect -- this their vindication from God (54:17).[8] Though Second Isaiah uses the cosmic imagery of apocalyptic, however, the means of the desired restoration of the holy community to a glorious Zion was anchored in real history.[9] A real historical person, Cyrus, would be the instrument of Yahweh's promised blessing (45:1 ff.). Nevertheless when the restoration had occurred, the prophetic group associated with the oracles of Second Isaiah was faced with a restored Israel in a restored Jerusalem with a renewed cult that did not fulfill the high expectations of Second Isaiah. It became increasingly difficult to believe that this kind of restoration was that desired by Yahweh.

Paul Hanson postulated that during the period of restoration following the Edict of Cyrus, two rival parties developed.[10] One party led by Zadokite priests adopted the program outlined by Ezekiel. Further, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah championed the apocalyptic vision of this program, and hoped for a decisive act of Yahweh to end Persian rule and establish a new Davidic kingdom and a Zadokite priesthood (Ezekiel 40-48; Haggai 2:6-9; Zechariah 1-6). For whatever reason, the more radical advocates of this apocalyptic movement gave way to the pragmatic elements, and a program of cooperation with Persia was adopted. At this point the apocalypses of Zechariah were transformed into propaganda for the establishment and the Zadokite priesthood.

---

[8] Brueggemann, The Land, pp. 147-150; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 146; Stuhlmueller, "Creation in Second Isaias," pp. 431, 433, 445, 448. Eichler proposed that the post-exilic prophets (especially Second Isaiah and Ezekiel) combined the concepts of inheritance as expressed in Psalm 16:5-6 and proclaimed that God would restore the promised land. "Inheritance, Lot, Portion," New International Dictionary, pp. 297-298.

[9] See Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 25; Hammerton-Kelly "Temple and Apocalyptic," p. 9; von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 133-137; Theodore M. Ludwig took issue with von Rad (p. 345, no. 1) but argued along similar lines and came to a similar conclusion. "The Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah," Journal of Biblical Literature, 92, 1973, pp. 356-357.

[10] Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 25-28; idem, "Apocalypticism," IDBS, pp. 32-33; cf. Hammerton-Kelly, "Temple and Apocalyptic," pp. 10-15; Bright, History of Israel, pp. 367 ff.; McKelvey, New Temple, pp. 11-12; cf. Clements, Old Testament Interpretation, pp. 148- 149.

The other rival party arose from the followers of Second Isaiah. This prophetic group was faced with the realization that a restored Israel in a restored Jerusalem with a renewed cult did not fulfill the promises of Second Isaiah. Increased oppression by the Zadokite group and increased alienation resulted in their rejection of the Zadokite program of restoration (e.g. the Temple cult, 66:1 ff.). It should be noted, however, that even among these emerging rival groups, the central vision remained the same. This is evident in Third Isaiah.

Although there is an abundance of cosmic imagery and no anchorage in real historical personalities and events to effect the reform, there is, in fact, the notion of the two ages in 65:17-25. Third Isaiah expresses the same common hopes for blessing in the land.[11] It is because their group is the true heirs of Abraham, the elect of God, that they claim the inheritance of blessing in the promised land (63:15-19; 65:9). Further, the restoration of the fruitfulness of the land, the glories of Jerusalem, the promise of descendants, and ultimate security and safety in the land are envisioned (60:1-61:11). Moreover, the place of the Temple is not emphasized because it was in the control of the rival party (63:18). The symbol of the Temple as the epitome of these promises may even have been rejected by this movement (66:1). Hanson has suggested that the writings associated with this movement extended into the last half of the fifth century (Isaiah 34-35; 24-27; 56-66; Malachi; Zechariah 9-14; Joel?).[12]

---

[11] Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 152.

[12] Hanson, Ibid., pp. 403 ff.; idem, "Apocalypticism," IDBS, p. 32. See Clifford, Cosmic Mountain, pp. 141, 181, 184; cf. Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comprehensive Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament, Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965, p. 1 (hereafter cited as Temple and Qumran); von Rad, Message of the Prophets, pp. 246-247. Against the thesis that Third Isaiah rejected the Temple see McKelvey, New Temple, pp. 25-26.

The reform of Ezra apparently provided a period of reconciliation so that Levites and prophets could once again be absorbed comfortably into the existing Jewish community. This, Hanson suggests, is the reason there is no apocalyptic writing from the fourth century B.C. There is, however, still a concern with the promise of blessing in the land. Walter Brueggemann proposed that the reform of Ezra be understood not as a parochial movement of separatist consciousness in strict adherence to the Mosaic law alone, but as an attempt to order life in the land in accordance with the covenant.[13] The land which Yahweh gave to the fathers as their promised heritage must be enjoyed according to the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant (Ezra 9:11-15; Nehemiah 9:6-10, 26-31, 36-37). Moreover, Walter Zimmerli proposed that in First and Second Chronicles, both the concerns of Deuteronomy and P are incorporated in such a way as to affirm Yahweh's promises to David and blessing in the land.[14] But this period of reconciliation did not long endure.

Hellenization arose as a new threat to post-Ezra Judaism and the promised blessing in the land. Indeed, in reference to the particular subject of the land as Israel's eternal inheritance, Hellenization was an effort to change the emphasis from ethnos to polis, denying the historical particularism of the Jewish faith concerning the land in terms of promise and inheritance.[15] Brueggemann proposed that

---

[13] Brueggemann, The Land, pp. 151 ff.; cf. Bright, History of Israel, p. 391.

[14] Zimmerli, O.T. Theology in Outline, pp. 92, 114-115, 179 ff., 182; cf. Peter R. Ackroyd, "Chronicles," IDBS, p. 157, sec. 4; cf. Guinan, Covenant in the Old Testament, pp. 45-47.

[15] For the diffusion of Hellenistic culture as a policy of Alexander the Great and his successors see W. W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, 6th reprint, Boston: Beacon Press, 1967, pp. 138 ff. For the dispersion of the Jewish people at and after this time see Glanville Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 73 ff. (hereafter cited as History of Antioch); Michael Grant, The Jews in the Roman World, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973, pp. 1 ff. (hereafter cited as Jews in Roman World); George La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire," Harvard Theological Review, 20, 1927, pp. 195 ff.; Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Diaspora Judaism -- An Abnormality? The Testimony of History," Judaism, 9, 1960, pp. 19-22 (hereafter cited as "Diaspora Judaism"); Peter Schäfer, "The Hellenistic and Maccabaean Periods," in Israelite and Judaean History, pp. 539-603 (hereafter cited as "Hellenistic and Maccabaean Periods").

Hellenization was resisted in two ways.[16] First, the sapiential literature of Judaism argued that their tradition of wisdom, with Yahweh as its source, was to be preferred to the intellectual enlightenment of Hellenization. Ben Sira preserved the teaching of the wisdom literature and desired the promised blessing in the land of Israel's inheritance (Sirach 36:1-12; 48:10).

Second, the oppression of the Seleucids and its subsequent destruction of the Jewish community resulted in the emergence of an apocalyptic movement within which groups like the early Hasidim preserved an apocalyptic perspective. Hence, some apocalyptists understood Israel's struggles at that time as part of the great cosmic struggle of which the elect would emerge as victor (Daniel).[17] Indeed, the Maccabees spearheaded a generally unified apocalyptic movement in a holy war fighting for the land of the fathers in the tradition of the old conquests (1 Maccabees 2:19-27; 15:33-34).[18] Moreover, in a similar pattern to the Zadokite leadership under the Ezekiel program of restoration, the Maccabean hierarchy cooperated with the power of Rome and pragmatically ensured their own governing power. Again, a response of dissatisfied groups (or group) similar to that of Third Isaiah occurred. One of these, the eventual Qumran community, withdrew from the Jewish community and maintained its own apocalyptic expectations of restored blessing in the land.

---

[16] Brueggemann, The Land, p. 162.

[17] For the severity of the persecution see Sherman E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957, pp. 140-141. In order to explain how Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to hellenize Jerusalem, Shäfer combined the theories of E. J. Bickermann and V. A. Tcherickover. "Hellenistic and Maccabaean Periods," in Israelite and Judaean History, pp. 562-564. For singling out the Law as a purpose of the Maccabean Revolt see Russell, Between the Testaments, pp. 42-48.

[18] For the importance of the Holy War, the Temple, and the Land in the Maccabean Revolt see the following: Hanson, "Zech. 9 and Ritual Pattern," pp. 48-51; Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 48-49; Brueggemann, The Land, pp. 163-164; John R. Bartlett, The First and Second Books of the Maccabees, The Cambridge Bible Commentary, ed. P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney, and J. W. Packer, Cambridge: At the Universtiy Press, 1973, pp. 26-33; Bo Reicke, The New Testament Era: The World of the Bible

The writings of the Qumran community indicate a significant regard for the promised land. The community perceived itself as the faithful remnant which should atone for the land, which had been polluted through the sins of the people and resulted in the dispersion of Israel (CDC 111:7-10).[19] Further, the community expected to possess the land on the basis of the covenant of the patriarchs (CDC 1:4-8).[20] Moreover, the means by which the land would be possessed would be a holy war of conquest, no doubt influenced by the conquest traditions in Joshua (IQM 1:5).[21] Finally, it should be noted that the Qumran community could perceive itself as the true Temple (IQS 5:5 ff.; 8:4-11; 9:3 ff.; IQ Hab. 12:1 ff.). The community may have reflected an attitude similar to that of Third Isaiah in its rejection of the Temple as defiled

---

from 500 B. C. to A. D. 100, trans. David E. Green, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968, pp. 49-54 (hereafter cited as New Testament Era).

[19] For the withdrawal to the desert see F. F. Bruce, New Testament History, Garden City: Anchor Books: Doubleday and Co., 1972, p. 104; Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures: In English Translation with Introduction and Notes, 3d. ed., rev. and enlarged, Garden City: Anchor Books, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976, p. 553; cf. Helen Waddell, The Desert Fathers, reprint, Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Paperbacks: University of Michigan Press, 1971, p. 13. For the concept of atonement see Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 98-100; McKelvey, New Temple, pp. 46-53.

[20] For the general attitude of the community in respect to apocalyptic, and the messianic banquet see Geza Vermes, "Dead Sea Scrolls," IDBS, p. 216, sec. 8; Krister Shendahl, "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective," in The Scrolls and the New Testament, pp. 9-11. For the limiting of the powers of the future Davidic Prince by a covenant see Wayne A. Meeks, The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 14, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967, p. 167 (hereafter cited as The Prophet-King). On the concept of the Qumran community as the true Israel and heir of the land see Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 52-55; La Sor, Scrolls and New Testament, p. 97; Leander E. Keck, "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Alteren Kirche, 57, 1966, pp. 74-77; Grant, Jews in Roman World, p. 44.

[21] For the concept of the Holy War see Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 108-111, 326-334; La Sor, Scrolls and New Testament, pp. 94-95. For a comparison of the apocalyptic tone between the War Scroll (IQM 17:5-9) and the Hodayot of Qumran (5:5-19) see Bonnie Pedrotti Kittel, "The Composition of the Hodayot of Qumran," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1975, pp. 267-276.

(Isaiah 63:18; 66:1).[22]

The literature of the intertestamental period reflects the tradition of the promise of blessing in the land as Israel's eternal inheritance. Sometimes the Mosaic tradition is utilized. At other times the specific promise to Abraham is indicated. Whether, however, the writings reflect prophetic, apocalyptic or sapiential perspectives, the common vision is that of restoration to a renewed holy land.[23]

The concept of blessing in the land as Israel's promised inheritance was carried into the first century of the Christian Era in the several currents of the stream of Jewish literature. Poetic, legal, historical, prophetic, sapiential and apocalyptic, ancient and contemporary spoke of the hope of blessing in the promised land. Indeed, the promise of the land as presented in the Old Testament was not tied to any one of these different genres or perspectives. For, according to the Jewish faith, before there was a national history, legal corpus or eschatology -- even before there was the nation of Israel, God called Abraham and swore to give him the land, and bless him and make him a nation. It was because of this, that time and time again the hope of blessing in the land was articulated through these different genres of literature. Not infrequently, different traditions or movements within Israel struggled to effect its particular understanding of life in the land as God's gift for them. Yet, the central goal remained the same: the blessing of life in the promised land.[24] It would be wrong, however, to ignore the significant role that apocalyptic played in carrying the concept into the Christian Era. For the centuries surrounding the time of Christ were charged with apocalyptic hope -- hope for the deliverance of the people of God and of their land.

---

[22] The position advanced by Gärtner(Temple and Qumran, pp. 11, 16-17, 107-120) that the Qumran community rejected the Temple altogether can no longer be maintained. The Temple Scroll makes it clear that the Qumran community expected to rebuild the Temple in the land (cols. 29-30; 40-46). Further, the Scroll makes a distinction between the Temple rebuilt by the Qumran community and the completely new Temple rebuilt by God on the apocalyptic "Day of Blessing." See Jacob Milgrom, "The Temple Scroll," Biblical Archaeologist, 41, no. 3, 1978, p. 114.

[23] Davidic-Zionic Traditions: Tobit 13:3-10; 14:4-6; Psalms of Solomon 11 and 17; Abrahamic-Patriarchal tradition: Jubilees 12:22-23; 22:24-28; Mosaic tradition: Judith 5:5-21 with 16:21; Jubilees 6:13; 21:22; (Combinations) Davidic and Mosaic: Testament of Dan 5:10-13; Jewish Sibylline Oracles 111. 268-277; 702-706; Paradisical, Patriarchal, Davidic: Testament of Job 33:1-9; Apocalyptic: 1 Enoch 25:4-6; 93:1-91:17 (in Charles' edition). On the concept that the righteous passed immediately to heaven after death ("Similitudes of Enoch" 60:8 in 1 Enoch) see T. Francis Glasson, Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology: with Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs, London: SPCK, 1961, p. 41. For the Davidic-Zionic traditions, and the blending of Jerusalem, Palestine and Paradise see Paul Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1903, pp. 371-375 (hereafter cited as Jüdische Eschatologie). For Psalms of Solomon 11 and 17 see Joachim Schüpphaus, Die Psalmen Salomos: ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts, Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, ed. K. H. Rengstorf, vol. 7, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977, pp. 55-56, 65-66, 71-73. Unless otherwise indicated, references to the pseudepigraphic works are from R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, 2 vols., reprint, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973, vol. 2 (hereafter cited as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of O.T.).

Since the discovery of the Qumran library, with its profusion of apocalyptic-type literature, it has been more and more recognized that apoalyptic was a fairly strong motif in Judaism in the years just preceding and just following the beginning of the Christian Era. Further, the ideas and themes in the apocalyptic literature were more widely circulated than the literature itself -- as evidenced by allusions to them in the writings of the Rabbis and the Church Fathers. These ideas exerted a definite influence after the books had, for the most part, disappeared.

One reason for the popularity of apocalyptic was that it provided encouragement and hope for Judaism in a period of oppression, particularly in the time of the Herods and Roman procurators up to the war in 66 A. D. Though the use and popularity of the apocalyptic

---

[24] Max I. Dimont in his study of American Jews and their lack of immigration to Palestine made an interesting note. Infuriated by the official stand of Reform Judaism, Rabbi Hillel Silver made the following remark: "A messianic hope not bound up with the restoration of Israel in Palestine is simply not found in Jewish religious literature from the time of Second Isaiah to our own time -- except of course in the writings of the Reformers." The Jews in America: The Roots, History, and Dating of American Jews, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978, p. 215.

UMI

literature in Judaism greatly diminished from 70 A. D. on, the ideas and beliefs made popular by this literature remained rather favorably influencial well into the third century, as is attested, in part, by the apocalyptic representations on the walls of the Synagogue of Dura Europas.[25]

The popularity of apocalyptic proved to be as great in Christianity as it was in Judaism. Early, the Church made use of the variety of Jewish books as their sacred religious authority. Some Apocryphal books which were apocalyptic in nature were incorporated in the sacred literature. Indeed, the apocalyptic literature in circulation, like the canonical Daniel, was quite suited to the Christian interpretation of ideas such as the resurrection of the dead, the fate of the wicked and the elect, the judgment of the world system, the imminent parousia of the Messiah, the messianic kingdom and/or the Two Ages. In fact, some of the apocalyptic material was reworked by Christians and made even more suitable for the propagation of a particular idea -- e.g. the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Sibylline Oracles. Further, Christianity not only used and reworked the Jewish Apocalyptic materials but also produced some of its own. In addition to the Johannine Revelation, the second century was a time that saw the production of the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of the Apostles, the Shepherd of Hermas, and quite possibly the Fifth and

---

[25] Bloch, Apocalyptic in Judaism, pp. 28-43, 86-118; R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of O. T., vol. 2, pp. vii-xi, idem, Eschatology, pp. 118-278. On the importance of the Temple and Jerusalem even to the Diaspora see Petuchowski, "Diaspora Judaism," p. 22; Samuel Safrai, "The Temple," in The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions, 2 vols., Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, ed. Samuel Safrai et al., Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974-1976, vol. 2, p. 906 (hereafter this book cited as Jewish People in First Century). Even Philo made reference to the land-promise theme combined with paradisical bliss: Philo, De Praemiis et Poenis, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, 8, pp. 417-421. Cf. Menahem Stern, "The Jewish Diaspora," in Jewish People in First Century, vol. 1, p. 214; Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism, p. 163, n. 287.

Sixth Books of Ezra.[26] Eventually, however, with the delay of the parousia and the expansion and success of the Christian mission, apocalyptic literature, as in Judaism after the wars of 66-70 and 132-135 A. D.,[27] diminished in value, and the ideas and beliefs of apocalyptic received interpretations closer to the theological perspective of the church triumphant.

In the earlier literature of the New Testament, there is clear evidence of this concept of the promised land as an ultimate hope for God's chosen people. Some would argue that it is at least implied in the earliest eschatological and apocalyptic views of Paul (1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1; 10:1-13:10). R. H. Charles, Clarence Tucker Craig, George Ladd, Martin Rist and John Hurd are among those who understand 1 Corinthians 15:23-28 in terms of a Messianic kingdom.[28] Whether that is Paul's meaning or not, however, cannot be determined with certainty. Further, John Munck argued for an apocalyptic understanding of Romans 9-11 in such a way that this concept of blessing in the promised land would be significant to Paul in terms of a territorial aspect.[29] Indeed, while W. D. Davies criticizes this interpretation as a rigid isolation of apocalypticism in Paul from Paulinism as a whole, he with great reservation, nevertheless, leaves the question open.[30]

---

[26] Morris, Apocalyptic, pp. 85-87; Bloch, Apocalyptic in Judaism, pp. 44-47, 93; Charles, Eschatology, pp. 306-417; Philipp Vielhauer, Introduction to "Apocalypses and Related Subjects" in New Testament Apocrypha, 2 vols., rev. ed., ed. Edgar Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, Robert McL. Wilson, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976, pp. 581-642; Martin Rist, "Pseudepigraphy and the Early Christians" in Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 33, ed. David Edward Aune, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972, pp. 75-91.

[27] George Howard argued that the Letter of Aristeas is an apology of the Dispersion in respect to their inability to live in the promised land. "The Letter of Aristeas and Diaspora Judaism," Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., 22, 1971, pp. 341-348. Petuchowski advanced a thesis in diametric opposition to that of Davies concerning Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 (Gospel and Land, p. 371 f.). According to Petuchowski "the messianic prophecy about the Torah's 'going forth from Zion' was fulfilled, at least partially, in the religious supervision of the Diaspora..." "Diaspora Judaism," p. 23. For the thesis that Temple worship continued until A. D. 135 see Kenneth W. Clark, "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A. D. 70," New Testament Studies, 6, 1959-1960, pp. 269-280.

[28] R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, 2 vols., The International Critical Commentary, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920, vol. 2, p. 184 (hereafter cited as Revelation of St. John and the series cited as ICC). See also Clarence Tucker Craig, exegesis of "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," IB, vol. 10, 1953, p. 236 (hereafter Craig's article cited as "First Corinthians"); Martin Rist, "Millenium," IDB, vol. 3, pp. 381-382,

---

sec. 2; Alexander C. Purdy, "Paul the Apostle," IDB, vol. 3, p. 703, sec. 10, b; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Eschatology of the NT," IDBS, p. 273, sec. 1, a; John Hurd, "Paul the Apostle," IDBS, p. 650, sec. 2; Archibald Robertson-Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 2d ed., ICC, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916, p. 354; George Elden Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975, pp. 558-559 (hereafter cited as Theology of N. T.); idem, The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974, p. 134 (hereafter cited as Presence of Future). Those who have argued for apocalypticism in Paul but seem to leave the question open: A. L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 13, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966, pp. 118, 170, n. 6 (hereafter cited as The Parousia); C. K. Barrett, "New Testament Eschatology," Scottish Journal of Theology, 6, 1953, p. 150; William Baird, "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective," New Testament Studies, 17, 1970-1971, pp. 324-325 (hereafter cited as "Pauline Eschatology").

[29] See Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clarke, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959, pp. 210-246, 282-309; idem, Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11, trans. Ingebory Nixon, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967; Keith F. Nickle, The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy, Studies in Biblical Theology, 48, London: Alec R. Allenson, 1966, pp. 129-143; John Hurd, "Offering for the Saints," IDBS, p. 638, par. 4.

[30] Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 197-198; idem, Gospel and Land, p. 208. Donald Juel examined the Qumran midrash on 2 Samuel 7:10-12, the targums on Zechariah 6:12, Isaiah 53:5, 2 Samuel 7:13-14, and the rabbinic teaching after A. D. 70. He concluded that there was strong evidence to indicate the Messiah would rebuild the Temple in purity -- the kind of apocalyptic concept that Paul may have held. See Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 31, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977, pp. 169-209 (hereafter cited as Messiah and Temple). The same conclusion is reached by Jacob Neusner. See A. R. C. Leaney and Jacob Neusner, "The Roman Era," in Israelite and Judaean History, p. 668.

Clearer evidence of the significance of the concept of the promised land as to its apocalyptic fulfillment and its territorial aspect is found in the Synoptics and Acts. In these writings, certain passages indicate that the kingdom of God or God's sovereign rule would not take place in a vacuum, but in the glorious restoration of the land. The messianic banquet (Matthew 8:11; Luke 13:28-29), the time when Jesus will again drink the wine in the kingdom (Mark 14:25; Luke 22:18), the promise that the twelve would sit on twelve thrones, judging the tribes of Israel (Matthew 19:28; Luke 22:30), and the question of the disciples concerning the time of the restoration of the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1:6) indicate the messianic kingdom.[31] Further, the beatitude that the meek shall inherit the land (Matthew 5:5; cf. Psalm 37:11) is not without eschatological overtones. Sherman E. Johnson, Walter Brueggemann, and Paul Hammer, in opposition to Davies, understand it this way.[32]

---

[31] This, in part, was because the early Church believed it was the Israel of God and continuous with the righteous of historic Israel. See Richard H. Hiers, The Historical Jesus and the Kingdom of God, University of Florida Humanities Monograph, 38, Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1973, pp. 106-112, 114; Francis M. Young "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity," New Testament Studies, 19, 1973, p. 338; Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Israel of God," Interpretation, 23, 1969, p. 71; J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, 3d rev. ed., London: Longman Group Limited, 1972, p. 157; Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, 14th ed., trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Smith, translation brought up to date and rev. Robert McLachlan Wilson, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971, pp. 143, 208; Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, reprint, 6 vols., Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961, vol. 2, pp. 588, 626 (hereafter cited as Kommentar zum Neuen Testament); Joseph F. Fitzmyer, Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971, pp. 275-276.

[32] Sherman E. Johnson, exegesis of "The Gospel According to St. Matthew," IB, vol. 7, 1951, p. 282; Brueggemann, The Land, p. 183, n. 36; Hammer, "Inheritance in the NT," IDBS, p. 428, sec. 1; Richard H. Hiers, "Eschatology and Methodology," Journal of Biblical Literature, 85, 1966, pp. 172-173. Juan Alfaro intended to make the same point about Matthew 5.5, but the reference reads or misreads "cf. Mt. 5, 4..." "The Land -- Stewardship," p. 61.

Yet, Davies, in his masterful handling of the land-promise theme in the earlier books of the New Testament, demonstrated that, for the most part, in these writings, the concept of the promised land met with rejection, spiritualization, historical concern, or in the case of the Johannine literature, sacramental concentration.[33] Though this conclusion is sound enough as far as it goes, recently, both Walter Brueggemann and Juan Alfaro have criticized Davies for not pursuing the question more in terms of an inheritance that has been promised through the perspective of Christ.[34] This is, in fact, what remains significant concerning this concept in the earlier New Testament books: the promise to Abraham and his true descendants, however much that promise has been transformed, is not a new promise, but an enduring one. It is here that the teaching of Paul is important concerning this theme.[35]

---

[33] Although the Law may endure in some sense, it is certain that the promises endure. Davies himself recognized this point and the significance of the land for Judaism. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge, London, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1977, pp. 295, 446-447. Cf. Bruce, New Testament History, p. 221; Kenneth W. Clark, "The Israel of God," in Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 33, ed. David E. Aune, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972, p. 165; Amos N. Wilder, "The Church and Israel in Light of Election," in Studia Evangelica, vol. 4:1, ed. F. L. Cross, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature, vol. 102, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968, pp. 354-356 (hereafter this series cited as TU).

[34] Alfaro, "The Land -- Stewardship," pp. 60-61; Brueggemann, The Land, p. 177. The same criticism can be made in respect to Davies' handling of Hebrews. See Brueggemann, The Land, p. 179; George Wesley Buchannan, To the Hebrews: Translation Commentary and Conclusions, The Anchor Bible, Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1972, pp. 189, 192. Against the thesis of Buchannan see Hugh Montefiore, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Black's New Testament Commentaries, ed. Henry Chadwick, London: Adam and Charles Black,1964, pp. 192-213. Eichler explained that the lack of the idea of inheritance in the Fourth Gospel is probably due to its emphasis on "the present nature and universality of salvation..." "Inheritance, Lot, Portion," New International Dictionary, vol. 1, p. 303.

[35] The problem of apocalyptic development or the lack of it in Paul is complex. Baird argued that although Paul's apocalyptic ideas underwent change, his major apocalyptic concepts remained constant. "Pauline Eschatology," pp. 316, 325-327. C. F. D. Moule argued that not chronology but circumstances altered the emphasis in eschatology. "The Influence of Circumstances on the use of Eschatology Terms," Journal

Paul argues that even if the rite of circumcision made one an Israelite, the breaking of the law abrogated circumcision so that it became uncircumcision (Romans 2:25). Indeed, real circumcision was of the heart (Romans 2:29). Further, Paul states that not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel. For only the children of the promise, those who have faith, are reckoned as the descendants of Abraham and therefore the children of God. This is what was meant by the words, "through Isaac shall your descendants be named" (Romans 4:13; 9:6-8). Although blindness would come upon part of Israel, at the proper time all Israel would be saved (Romans 11:25-26).[36] It is, therefore, by virtue of being a true spiritual seed of Abraham that the true Israel becomes partaker of the divine promises, for the promise was given to Abraham and his children of the promise (Romans 9:8). It is, moreover, precisely this point Paul makes in order to demonstrate that the Church is heir to the promises (Galatians 3:15 ff.).

Paul, it should be emphasized, does not simply substitute Christ for the promises when he writes "how many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the Yes" (2 Corinthians 1:20).[36a] Rather, inasmuch as the believer is in Christ, he is heir to all the promises of which Christ is heir (Galatians 3:16; Romans 8:17). Concerning this point, Walter Brueggemann writes:

---

of Theological Studies, 15, 1964, pp. 1-2, 8-15. John J. Gunther advanced the thesis that Paul may have toned down his apocalyptic teaching in view of adversaries "whose background was a mystic-apocalyptic, ascetic, non-conformist, syncretistic Judaism..." St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 35, 1973, Leiden: E. J. Brill, p. 315 (hereafter cited as St. Paul's Opponents).

[36] See Mathias Rissi, The Future of the World: An Exegetical Study of Revelation 19:11-22:15, rev. ed., Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., 23, Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1970, p. 75 (hereafter cited as Future of the World).

[36a] This translation is my own.

> Those who gather around Jesus are heirs. Of course Davies is correct that the inheritance has been boldly redefined. But we cannot therefore deny the central and enduring referent which is land, unless we are to succomb to an otherworldly hermeneutic.
>
> It is central to Paul's argument that the promise endures. The heirs in Christ are not heirs to a new promise, but the one which abides and that is centrally land.[37]

It should be noted that Paul never clearly refers to a promise of the inheritance to the land. This is important. For this indicates that this concept as such was not central to Paul's message. This is at least the point Davies endeavors to make. Yet Paul does not deny the land aspect of the promise as an inheritance of the believer. This too is important. For it forces us to stop short of Davies' assertion that Paul completely redefines the promise of being in the land to being in Christ. And this is the point of Walter Brueggemann and Juan Alfaro as well as those who would understand Paul's apocalypticism to include a messianic kingdom. Further, while Davies believes Paul is silent concerning the land in deference to the Law -- the guide for life in the land -- the opposite interpretation would seem to be the case. For the promise to Abraham preceded the giving of the Law. In fact both Galatians 3:15 ff. and Romans 4:14 ff. confirm this. The Law did not annul the promise. On the contrary, the promise that Abraham and his descendants should inherit the world endures (Romans 4:14). The believer is heir to the world (Romans 4:13) even as Christ is heir to the world (1Corinthians 15:23 ff.).[38]

---

[37] Brueggemann, The Land, p. 178; Paul S. Minear, "The Time of Hope in the New Testament," Scottish Journal of Theology, 6, 1953, pp. 346-347. Hans Dieter Betz in respect to Galatians 3:6-18 argued that Paul's argument was an "exemplum" in which "Abraham would be classified as a historical example" and the heirs are heirs in the strictest legal sense. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," New Testament Studies, 21, 1975, p. 371 f.

[38] On Paul reflecting the Davidic tradition in Romans 1:3-4 see Dennis C. Duling, "The Promises to David and Their Entrance into Christianity -- Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis," New Testament Studies, 19, 1973, p. 77. For the elect as heir to the world because of the promise to Abraham see Strack and Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, vol. 3, p. 209; Henry Alford, The Greek Testament: A

This is Paul's conclusion, a conclusion which is similar to that of Pseudo-Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus in the second century. For each of these writers uses the theme of the Church as fellow-heirs with Christ of the promises to Abraham in order to provide an enduring hope for the inheritance of the promised land.

Critical and Exegetical Commentary, rev. Everett F. Harrison, 4 vols. in 2, Chicago: Moody Press, 1958, vol. 2, pp. 350-351 (hereafter cited as *The Greek Testament*); Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 6th ed., trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns, London, Oxford, and New York: Oxford University Press, 1968, pp. 132-135; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vol., ICC, 6th ed., entirely rewritten, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark Limited, 1975, vol. 1, pp. 239-240. Horst Seebas, "'Αβρααμ," *New International Dictionary*, vol. 1, p. 79.

PART 2

LITERATURE OF SECOND CENTURY IN WHICH THE PROMISE OF THE LAND IS NOT EXPECTED IN ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL OR APOCALYPTIC SENSE

INTRODUCTION TO PARTS 2 AND 3

THE LATER NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS AND THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY

The period after the earlier New Testament books up to and including Irenaeus witnessed the production of a considerable amount of Christian literature.[1] These writings, furthermore, were for the most part anonymous and pseudononymous. Letters, manuals of teaching, apocalypses, homilies, acts and apologies were composed for purposes of edification, teaching organization, propaganda, and defense of the Christian faith. Some of this literature together with the four gospels, Acts and the earlier epistles of Paul eventually found a permanent place in the New Testament canon.

Jean Daniélou focused on the Jewish theology present in the literature of this period. He argued that this literature was the product of the Church in a time during which the Church was largely a Judaistic religion in character. Further, he proposed that the theology of this literature was distinguished fundamentally by apocalyptic.[2] His characterization of this literature, however, is perhaps stated too strongly. Considering the heterogeneity of this literature, it is difficult to perceive Christianity as expressed in such a homogeneous Jewish theological perspective as Daniélou proposes.[3] These writings are of very different types. Yet, it is the special achievement of Jean Daniélou to have demonstrated the wealth of Jewish ideas and concerns which influenced this early Christian literature. Certainly, the most significant Jewish influence on the Church until about the middle of the second century was the Greek translations of the Jewish theological books.[4] These writings would have provided the early Church with the legal, historical, theological, liturgical, apologetic and apocalyptic perspectives of the Jewish faith.

---

[1] Martin Dibelius, A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, English translation, The International Library of Christian Knowledge, ed. William A. Brown and Bertram L. Woolf, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936, pp. 15-24 (hereafter cited as N. T. and Early Christian Literature); Edgar J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature, enlarged and rev. Robert M. Grant, Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press, 1966, pp. 1-6 (hereafter cited as Early Christian Literature).

[2] Jean Daniélou, A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicea (Volume One): The Theology of Jewish Christianity, trans. John Austin Baker, London and Philadelphia: The Westminster Press and Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964, pp. 3-5, 7-9 (hereafter cited as Theology of Jewish Christianity).

[3] A. F. J. Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity," New Testament Studies, 20, 1974, pp. 425-426; A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinink, Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian Sects, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 36, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, pp. ix-x ff.;

When we turn our attention to the subject of the promised land in the Christian literature of this period, we find no single theological dogma. Indeed, the different Christian writings of this period express views which at times appear to be in diametric opposition to each other regarding this subject. Further, even though it was the achievement of Irenaeus to "explain the relationship between Judaism and Christianity" and to set forth a conscious conception of catholic Christianity,[5] his understanding of this theme of the promised land was in no way representative of any sort of "catholic" view up to his time. Indeed, from the evidence of the existing sources, his understanding of this theme was representative of the minority -- representing an Eastern view, predominately an Asian position in which the promise of blessing in the land was regarded as a legitimate inheritance of the Church.[6]

Robert A. Kraft, "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and Its 'Theology': Problems of definition and methodology," in Judéo-Christianisme: Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Daniélou, vol. 60, ed. Joseph Moingt, Paris: Recherches de Science Religieuse, 1972, pp. 86-91 (hereafter this volume cited as Judéo-Christianisme).

[4] Hans von Campenhausen, The Formation of the Christian Bible, trans. John Austin Baker, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972, pp. 73-74 (hereafter cited as The Christian Bible).

[5] Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought: Volume 1, Early and Eastern from Jesus to John of Damascus, New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932, p. 148 (hereafter cited as History of Christian Thought: Vol. 1).

[6] Cf. Frederick C. Grant, "The Eschatology of the Second Century," American Journal of Theology, 21, 1917, pp. 208-209. For the Jewish population in Asia Minor and the merchant trade with the Rhone Valley where Irenaeus eventually served see W. H. C. Frend, Martyrdom and

As the literature of this period relates to the subject of the promise of blessing in the land, therefore, it is appropriate to divide these writings into two groups. First, there are those writings which either do not show probable concern with this promise as an apocalyptic concern of the Church or reject it altogether. Second, there are those writings which demonstrate a concern for this promise as an inheritance of the Church in its apocalyptic destiny.

For the most part, the writings of this period are concerned with matters of polity and discipline in the Church, with the practical problems of daily Christian living, and with the defense of the faith from within and without. As a result, in these writings, concern with theological subjects such as the apocalyptic schemata of the Church is secondary or even tertiary at best. Inasmuch, therefore, as a detailed discussion of the end times is often lacking, it is necessary to examine the extent and purpose of eschatological and apocalyptic elements in each writing in order to determine, if possible, the tradition or motif reflected in these elements and the particular significance this has in the writing.

The fact that competent scholars are often in opposing camps in positions concerning date, origin and authorship of the subsequent New Testament books and other Christian writings in the second century is sufficient grounds to commend caution and humility rather than dogmatism. This is particularly true of 1 Peter, James, and Barnabas, to say nothing of Jude, 2 Peter, the Didache, Hermas, and 2 Clement. It is, therefore, this writer's intention to indicate a probable context of these writings. The identity of an author *per se* is for the most part not crucial for this study.

Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from Maccabees to Donatus, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965, pp. 4-5, 178-182 (hereafter cited as *Martyrdom and Persecution*). For the thesis that Jewish Christianity "ceased to exist at the destruction of Jerusalem" see Johannes Munck, "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *New Testament Studies*, 6, 1959-1960, p. 107. For the somewhat questionable idea that after A. D. 66-70, Judaism left the Church to face the Greeks alone see Dom Gregory Dix, *Jew and Greek: A Study in the Primitive Church*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953, p. 111.

CHAPTER 1

ROME

Six letters of either certain or possible Roman origin are pertinent to this study because of the apocalyptic elements they contain. These are 1 Peter, 1 Clement, Hermas, 2 Clement, Jude and 2 Peter. They range in date of composition quite possibly from the last decade of the first century to the middle of the second century. In these letters, subjects such as the promised inheritance of the Church, the parousia, and even the promised land are mentioned. It is significant, however, to note that the concept of promised blessing in the land as the inheritance of the elect is nowhere reflected in the expectation or apocalyptically charged statements of these writings. Rather, what is presented as the promised hope of the believer is salvation in the heavenly kingdom of God.

1 PETER

The origin and authorship of 1 Peter is very problematic. This writing, as we have it, whether or not it was originally a sermon dealing with baptism, is a letter. Its purpose was to encourage Christians in Asia Minor to persevere in their faith in spite of fierce persecution. The letter reminds the readers of the gift of baptism and holds forth the promise of a crown of glory in the heavenly kingdom in order to strengthen them in the ensuing trials.

In an attempt to determine a probable date, various scholars have sought to identify the persecution. Those under Nero, Domitian and Trajan have been proposed. W. C. van Unnik, however, argued that no particular state persecution was in the letter's purview (5:9).[1] Rather, it was a more personal persecution of the noncomforming Church as a minority by those outside the faith (4:3-4). In other words, the persecution could have occurred any time in the first or second century. If the designation of the elect as the Dispersion is not meant to be pressed literally, Gentile Christians may be meant (1:18-4:3-4), and this would perhaps favor a later date. At any rate, the author was convinced that the Church was on the edge of eternity (4:7), and the judgment had begun (4:17).[2]

---

[1] W. C. van Unnik, "Peter, First Letter of," IDB, vol. 3, p. 762, sec. 5. The Greek text used is the following: The Greek New Testament, ed. Kurt Aland et al., 3d. ed., New York, London, Edinburgh, Amsterdam and Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1975.

The authorship of Peter has been seriously questioned, and this again would favor a later date if the letter were pseudonymous. It has been argued that: there is no reference to the earthly life of Jesus; the letter presupposes the atmosphere of Paul's teaching; the persecution indicated does not best correspond to that under Nero; and the relative excellence of the use of the Greek language precludes Peter's authorship.[3] This last criticism has been weakened recently by the studies of John Sevenster and A. W. Argyle, among others, which have indicated a better and more common knowledge of Greek in the lower classes of Galilee.[4] Indeed, none of these criticisms by themselves or together are decisive against the possible authorship of Peter. In fact, the criticism concerning reference to the earthly life of Jesus is one of the points made to indicate the pseudonymity of 2 Peter. Further, the relationship between 1 Peter and Pauline theology (especially Ephesians) may simply be the result of shared common material by the time Peter wrote this letter. Yet, the nature of the persecution does seem to fit that under Domitian better than that under Nero, and if the trials indicated correspond better to the Domitian persecution, it seems more probable to designate this letter as a pseudonymous composition in the last decade of the first century.[5] This, however, cannot be maintained with certainty.

---

[2] Cf. A. L. Moore, The Parousia, p. 151.

[3] See Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, rev. 17th ed., trans. Howard Clark Kee, Nashville: Abingdon, 1975, pp. 423-424 (hereafter cited as INT).

[4] A. W. Argyle, "Greek Among the Jews of Palestine in New Testament Times," New Testament Studies, 20, 1974, pp. 87-89 (hereafter cited as "Greek in New Testament Times"); John N. Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 19, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968, pp. 176-191 (hereafter cited as Do You Know Greek?). Cf. Harry J. Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome, The Morris Loeb Series, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960, p. 75; Nigel Turner, Grammatical Insights into the New Testament, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1965, pp. 174-188.

EXEGESIS: AN OVERVIEW

The apocalyptic material in 1 Peter is decidedly different from that in Luke's presentation in Acts (1:6; 2:14-36; 3:12-26). In the earlier speeches of Peter in Acts, Peter's apocalyptic and eschatological expectations are definitely anchored in the promises to Abraham and David (3:25; 2:30). There is, further, an attempt to deal with these promises in terms of the apocalyptic hopes of historical Israel. According to Ernst Haenchen, Luke endeavored to show that all the prophetic promises (3:21), especially the blessings of Abraham, were first offered to historical Israel.[6] These promises, however, were being fulfilled through Christ, and it was therefore necessary for the Jews to turn to Christ in order to be truly God's people and heirs of the promises (3:23). In this way, Luke adumbrated what would be explicit in Acts 13:46 and provided a means whereby he could proceed with his presentation of the history of the early Church.[7]

---

[5] See Bo Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, The Anchor Bible, Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1964, p. 71 (hereafter cited as James, Peter, and Jude). John A. T. Robinson has recently championed the arguments of George Edmundson's The Church in Rome in the First Century, London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1913, pp. 145-150, 188-205 (hereafter cited as Church in Rome). Robinson attempts to date 1 Peter, 1 Clement and Revelation either before or as close to A. D. 70 as possible. Redating the New Testament, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976, pp. 112-235. A. N. Sherwin-White rejected Nero's action as extending to the provinces. "Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again," Journal of Theological Studies N. S., 3, 1952, p. 202. It is true that there was military activity outside Rome at this time but unrelated to the "persecution." David Magie explained that the Claudian emperors were involved in expanding the realm eastward and that this affected Asia Minor in particular. Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ, 2 vols., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950, pp. 560 ff. (hereafter cited as Roman Rule in Asia Minor). Glanville Downey pointed out that Nero had a rebellion of Jews put down in A. D. 66/67, but this was not connected with the Christian "persecution" in Rome. History of Antioch, pp. 198-199. Robert J. Getty's conclusion is similar to that of Sherwin-White, "Nero's Indictment of the Christians in A. D. 64: Tacitus' Annals 15. 44. 2-4," in The Classical Tradition, ed. Luipold Wallach, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966, pp. 285-292.

[6] Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, pp. 208-212.

[7] For Luke's efforts to correct this original understanding of the disciples see Richard H. Hiers, "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia

It is true, as W. D. Davies has pointed out, that Luke has given a different significance to this promise so that the territorial aspect virtually gives way to the broader concept of salvation.[8] Yet, both the language and the concept of blessing in these sections of Acts are much closer to the imagery and expectations of earlier Judaism regarding the promised land than are apocalyptic expectations in 1 Peter. For in 1 Peter the concept of the promised inheritance of blessing in the land has been uprooted from any earthly context and placed firmly in the heavenly sphere.

There is, to be sure, a good deal of Jewish color in 1 Peter. As is the case in 1 Clement, the Church, by implication, is designated the true Israel, heirs with the faithful Israel of the Old Testament.[9] The Christians are referred to as the elect dispersion, a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, and God's own people (1:1; 2:4-10). When the prophets prophesied concerning the grace which would effect the Christian's salvation, they not only did so through the spirit of Christ but in service to Christians (1:10-12). Christian wives could be regarded as the children of Sarah if they conducted themselves in marriage after Sarah's example. Yet, the focus of the letter as a whole,

---

in Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, 20, 1974, pp. 146-150; Nikolaus Walter, "Tempelzerstörung und synoptische Apokalypse," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, 57, 1966, pp. 48-49.

[8] Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 252-287.

[9] Peter Richardson rejected the designation of the Church as the Israel of God until Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. Richardson repeatedly pointed to the ambiguity of the evidence. The present writer fails to recognize any general ambiguity. Israel in the Apostolic Church, Society for New Testament Studies, monograph ser., 10, London: Cambridge University Press, 1969. In contrast to Richardson see Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Tradition (A History of the Development of Doctrine): 1 The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600), Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1971, pp. 12-15 (hereafter cited as Emergence of Catholic Tradition); Barrett, "New Testament Eschatology," pp. 227-228; Birger A. Pearson, "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation," Harvard Theological Review, 64, 1971, pp. 93-94. Severino Pancaro, "The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of St. John," New Testament Studies, 21, 1975, pp. 400-405.

and even the focus of the apocalyptic passages themselves is not on any earthly aspect of the promised inheritance.

At the beginning of the letter the heavenly orientation of the apocalyptic expectations is made clear. The elect are assured that their inheritance is secure in the heavenly realm (1:4). The same word, κληρονομία is used in 1 Peter as in the LXX, and this would recall the land of Canaan as the promised inheritance of the people of God.[10] Though, it is true that this word at times referred to other subjects such as Israel as the inheritance of Yahweh (Jeremiah 50:11; cf. 51:19), it had its primary significance in terms of the physical dimension of the promised land. Yet, here, the word, as Paul Hammer has pointed out, points not toward an earthly concern but rather to an "imperishable inheritance beyond history."[11] It may be that the earthly Canaan has been transformed into "a kind of heavenly Canaan," as Claude H. Thompson suggests.[12] This, in fact, would correspond to the imagery in the Odes of Solomon (11:14-21; 15:10-11).[13] Yet, the use of inheritance in this passage is practically synonymous with salvation in Jesus Christ or eternal life in the new world. This would be close to the meaning given it in Enoch 40:9, 2 Enoch 50:2 (especially MS.A), and Psalms of Solomon 14:4 ff.[14] For unlike the passages in the Odes of Solomon, there is no mention of the word "land" which would identify Canaan as the point of reference. An interpretation, then, that sees here the idea of a heavenly kingdom to be brought down to earth in any messianic sense, as A. R. C. Leaney seems to suggest, is extremely curious.[15] Rather, as Ernest Best asserts, inheritance here has a different significance.[16] Indeed, the three adjectives -- ἄφθαρτος ἀμίαντος ἀμάραντος -- all occurring in the Book of Wisdom (12:1; 13:4; 4:2; 6:12), used here, strengthen this argument. As Edward G. Selwyn pointed out, the adjectives "are well suited to describe an inheritance in which life is immortal, and worship pure and ethical, and the satisfactions offered beyond the vicissitudes of time."[17]

---

[10] Archibald M. Hunter, Exegesis of "The First Epistle of Peter," IB, vol. 12, 1957, p. 94.

[11] Hammer, "Inheritance in the NT," IDBS, p. 428.

[12] Claude Holmes Thompson, "The First Letter of Peter," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 926.

[13] Unless otherwise noted, the annotated translation of James Hamilton Charlesworth is used for the Odes of Solomon. The Odes of Solomon, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973, pp. 52-53, 68. Walter Bauer noted that of the five occurrences of the word Paradise in the Odes, four of them are in Ode 11. "Die Oden Salomos," in Neutestamentliche Apokryphen: in deutscher Übersetzung, 4th rev. ed., 2 vols., ed. Edgar Hennecke and William Schneemelcher, Tübinger: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1968, vol. 2, p. 591, n. 10 (hereafter cited as Neutestamentliche Apockryphen).

[14] Possibly 2 Baruch 44:13. Reference to the pseudepigrapha of the Old Covenant are to the edition of Charles unless otherwise noted. For the reference to the Psalms of Solomon see J. Rendel Harris, The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, Cambridge: At the University Press, 1909. Cf. Joachim Schüppaus, Die Psalmen Salomos, p. 60.

The concept of inheritance, therefore, in 1 Peter 1:4, is emptied altogether of its earthly connotation and filled with the meaning of salvation in the eternity beyond history. These were the last times (4:7), the times of which the prophets prophesied concerning God's operative grace that would bring about the hoped for inheritance of the salvation which was ready to be revealed (1:5-12).[18]

Another passage in this letter uses language reminiscent of the earthly theocracy which both experienced and hoped to experience the promise of blessing in the land. In 1 Peter 2:4-10 we have a description of the Church in terms all of which come from the Old Testament. The believers are a chosen race, a holy and royal priesthood, God's own nation and people (compare Exodus 19:6, Deuteronomy 7:6, Isaiah 43:20 ff.; Hosea 2:23). This section, in respect to the promised inheritance of Canaan in the Old Testament, noticeably stops short of mentioning the promised inheritance of blessing in terms of any earthly or messianic consummation. This new Israel does not look for blessing and salvation in any heavenly Canaan brought down to earth. Instead, the Church has been called out of darkness into God's marvelous light - called to God's eternal glory in Christ (5:10).

---

[15] A. R. C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude: A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, A Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter*, Cambridge Bible Commentary, Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967, p. 19 (hereafter cited as *Letters of Peter and Jude*).

[16] Ernest Best, *I Peter*, New Century Bible, London: Oliphants, 1971, p. 76.

[17] Edward Gordon Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London: Macmillan and Company, 1946, p. 124.

[18] This compares favorably with the sense of the "Freer Logion" of Mark 16:14. Joachim Jeremias noted this. "Conversations between Jesus and his Disciples after the Resurrection, '1. The Freer Logion: [Mk.] 16:14 W'," in *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 1, p. 189. Cf. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 2d rev. ed., New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968, pp. 56-57; Aland, ed., *The Greek New Testament*, p. 197, n. 4. It ought to be noted that the reference in 1 Peter 1:7 to testing by fire may reflect the earlier suffering by fire under Nero. See Michael Grant, *Nero*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970, pp. 154-161.

One passage in 1 Peter is significant because of its lack of apocalyptic reference to the promise. This is the section in which Abraham and Sarah are discussed (3:1-7). Unlike other passages in the New Testament (e.g. Luke 1:73; Acts 3:25; Romans 4:14; Galatians 3-4), there is no eschatological or apocalyptic significance indicated nor is there any concern with the true children of Abraham and Sarah as recipients of the historic promise. As is the case in 1 Clement, the reference here is for the purpose of godly living.[19]

There is one further point pertinent to our subject in 1 Peter. It is asserted that Christ already has angels, authorities and powers subject to him (3:21-22). There is no need for a messianic kingdom in which to experience this authority (contrast 1 Corinthians 15:23 ff.). The end is at hand and judgment has already begun (4:7,17-18). Indeed, Christ, who has the dominion forever, will restore, strengthen, and reward the believer with a crown of glory after the present suffering is patiently endured (5:1-11).

In 1 Peter, therefore, the apocalyptic expectations are presented in terms of history and salvation beyond history. The promise of the salvation ready to be revealed is the hope which provides the believer with the motivation to endure the present suffering. The concept of inherited blessing and salvation has been divested of any earthly garb and clothed in the robes of eternity.

---

[19] The Sarah motif is used differently in 1 Clement (31:1 f.) than in Second Isaiah (cf. 54:1 f.).

1 CLEMENT[20]

The purpose of this communication of the Roman Church was to heal the schism στάσις in the Corinthian Church at the end of the first century. Consequently, this official letter is largely an exhortation to the Corinthian Christians to avail themselves of the virtues of their faith, as they once did, and restore the proper order and harmony to the Church. In addition to the Hellenistic tints in the letter, there are many Jewish traditions present which help illustrate the virtues of and reasons for proper Christian conduct.[21] It is, therefore, these Jewish traditions and possible apocalyptic elements which deserve examination in regard to the land promise theme.

THE TRUE ISRAEL

The letter presents the Church as the true Israel, God's special portion (8:1; 29:1-30:1). Further, the Church is understood as being continuous with the faithful Israel of the Old Testament (7; 17; 32:4;

---

[20] Unless otherwise noted, the translation used for the Apostolic Fathers is that of Robert M. Grant, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, 6 vols., Toronto, New York, and London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1964-1968 (hereafter these volumes cited as *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. number and the relevant author in respect to the annotation). For Hermas, the editions used are the following: Molly Whittaker, *Die Apostolischen Väter I: Der Hirt des Hermas*, die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsheller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956; Robert Joly, *Hermas: le Pasteur*, Sources Chrétiennes, no. 53, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1958. Joly's work was consulted and will not be used unless it differs from that of Whittaker. For the rest of the Apostolic Fathers the edition of Karl Bihlmeyer has been used. *Die Apostolischen Väter*, Neubearbeitung der Funkschein Ausgabe, 2d ed., with supplement by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.

[21] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "Clement, Epistles of," *IDB*, vol. 1, pp. 648-649. Donald A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 34, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, pp. 1-8 (hereafter cited as *Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*). The date of the epistle is usually assigned to the last decade of the first century. L. W. Barnard, "Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian," *New Testament Studies*, 10, 1963-1964, p. 255. Some date the letter as early as A. D. 80 or 70. See W. A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers: A source book of theological and historical passages from the Christian writings of the Pre-Nicene and Nicene eras*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1970, p. 6 (hereafter cited as *Faith of Early Fathers*); John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, pp. 327-335.

45:1; 46:1). As Israel had been elected from among the nations, Christians are called from all the nations and made the elect of God (59:2-3). By rephrasing a Greek translation of Isaiah 60:17, the letter maintains that the ministry in the Church is essentially that of ancient times (42:5). Indeed, the letter exhibits a high regard for historic Israel, and does not hesitate to emphasize the idea that the Church is the spiritual Israel of God.

PARADISE, RENEWAL, PROMISED LAND

The freedom with which the author associates the Church and its ministers with ancient Israel, the frequency with which he draws from Old Testament examples, and the number of apocalyptic elements in the letters, make it tempting to put more weight behind the force of the Jewish elements in the letter's apocalyptic than there is. Indeed, some of the passages which contain elements originally of an eschatological or apocalyptic force could easily lend themselves to the kind of interpretation that would provide a framework into which the Davidic or Abrahamic traditions could fit (50:3-4). But the tone of the letter as a whole, and even the tone of the individual passages themselves is such that there is no apocalyptic or eschatological emphasis, and consequently no justification for this kind of interpretation.[22] Several passages, in fact make this clear.

The first passage concerns the intermediate state of the saved dead, the bodily resurrection, and the eschatological kingdom of Christ, all of which are formal elements of Jewish apocalyptic. The passage is as follows:

> '...but those made perfect in love according to the grace of God have a place among the godly who will be made manifest when Christ's kingdom comes.' For it is written, 'Enter into your inner rooms for a little while until my wrath and anger pass, and I will remember a good day and I will raise you up from your graves (50:3-4; cf. Isaiah 26:20).'

---

[22] Cf. Otto Knoch, Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemenbriefes: eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Theophaneia Beiträge zur Religions-und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums, 17, Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1964, pp. 300, 350-383, 452, 457-458 (hereafter cited as Erschatologie des ersten Clemenbriefs).

It would be appropriate to assume that the writer understood "the place among the godly" according to the Jewish tradition of an interim state, a Sheol or Hades in which there are sometimes different sections varying from places of torment to places similar to paradise. Parallels to this apocalyptic element are found in 1 Enoch 22 and 4 Ezra 7:75 ff.[23] Further, in this context, with the force of this apocalyptic element behind it, the presentation of the resurrection of the saints at the coming of the kingdom of Christ may reflect the Jewish tradition of a resurrection of the righteous to share in the temporary messianic kingdom before the New Age. This, in fact, is the teaching in 1 Enoch 90:33. Moreover, the dispersion is gathered into the kingdom at this time -- a theme intimately associated with the land promise in its territorial aspect (1 Enoch 93:1-10; 91:12-17; 90:33). It would be possible, therefore, in light of these apocalyptic elements and parallels to Jewish messianic traditions to read into the phrase "the kingdom of Christ" the idea of the kingdom of the Messiah or glorious Davidic kingdom and the gathering together of the elect to enjoy this kingdom. But even more probable is the interpretation of James A. Kleist in which the souls of the righteous before Christ's coming are seen as being kept in "the _Limbo Patrum_ until Christ after His resurrection" should release them.[24] The idea involved in the kingdom of Christ would then be that of the kingdom of God, the New Age. Clearly, the passage in the overall context is one of exhortation to repentance and right conduct. The eschatological and apocalyptic elements portray no vital role, unless it is to encourage the Corinthian Christians to live a life of godly fear and love (1 Clement 51:2).[25]

---

[23] Cf. Angelo P. O'Hagan, _Material Re-creation in the Apostolic Fathers_, TU, vol. 100, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968, p. 95 (hereafter cited as _Material Re-creation_).

[24] James A. Kleist, _The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch_, Ancient Christian Writers, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1946, vol. 1, p. 115, n. 149. Cf. Hagner, _Old and New Testament in Clement of Rome_, pp. 131-132.

[25] A position between that of the present wirter and O'Hagan is represented by Robert Grant, _Apostolic Fathers_, vol. 2, pp. 81-82.

Another passage which contains a formal element of apocalyptic with cosmological significance is the one concerning Noah and the proclamation of the world's renewal (9:4). The passage reads as follows:

> Noah, because he was found faithful in his
> service, proclaimed renewal to the world,
> for through him the Master saved the animals
> that entered peacefully into the ark
> (παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν)

The apocalyptic element here reflects the Jewish tradition of cosmological renewal and the New Age (compare Sibylline Oracles 1. 148-199: and VII 9-11; 27-28 of the Christian Sibylline Oracles). In fact, even Matthew 19:28 uses the word palingenesia in an eschatological sense, and Josephus uses the term palingenesia of the restoration of the land of Israel (Antiquities, XI. 3.9). But while this apocalyptic element elsewhere carries with it the tradition of the cosmological drama of destruction renewal first by water and then by fire, in 1 Clement the force of this tradition is absent.[26] Indeed, this element is used simply to present the received tradition in terms of a virtuous life of faithfulness. There is no effort to heighten or even draw attention to the apocalyptic mood at all.

The final passage for our consideration involves the land promise theme presented in terms of its territorial aspect. But here again, the tradition which is rich in eschatological and apocalyptic significance whether in an earthly or an heavenly sense, serves no vital eschatological function (10:1-7). The writer faithfully reproduces the story of the call of Abraham and enumerates the essential elements of the promise of land, progeny, and blessing. But the tradition is treated in terms of exhortation, demonstrating that God blesses an obedient man. There is, strictly speaking, not even an implication that the land promise, with or without its territorial aspect, has any significance for the Church, the New Israel. If anything, what appears to be significant to the writer is Abraham's faith and hospitality (10:7).

---

[26] Later it is used with apocalyptic significance in 2 Peter 2:5, 3:5 f. Cf. Jack P. Lewis, A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968, pp. 102-105 (hereafter cited as Interpretation of the Flood).

It would seem, therefore, that the position of 1 Clement in relation to the land promise theme can be ascertained with a good deal of certainty. Nowhere does the letter give any indication of holding to the eschatological or apocalyptic significance of elements or traditions related to the idea of the messianic kingdom in which the land promise is realized with its territorial aspect. In fact, even when this subject is expressly related, as in 1 Clement 10:1 ff., the land promise theme is divested of its eschatological and apocalyptic garb and presented as a bare historical fact demonstrating the significance and example of Abraham's faith. Indeed, Otto Knoch's thesis that in 1 Clement, eschatology plays no significant role, but is merely accepted as part of the received tradition, is born out at least in regard to the kind of Jewish eschatology and apocalypticism discussed above.[27]

HERMAS

Hermas consists of five Visions, twelve Mandates and ten Similitudes of which Visions I - IV were originally a separate work, dating from, perhaps, the end of the first century. Vision V to the end comprise the second work, and was probably added to the first four Visions and completed c. 135 - 140. In this completed form, Vision V introduces the Mandates and Mandate XII introduces the Similitudes.[28]

---

[27] Knoch, Eschatologie des ersten Clemenbriefs, p. 458. The kind of moralism in 1 Clement -- free will and works or divine election -- is an open issue. Some scholars have insisted that the main emphasis is believing obedience. McGiffert, History of Christian Thought: Vol. 1, p. 85; Thomas F. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers, Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1948, pp. 54-55 (hereafter cited as The Doctrine of Grace). J. B. Lightfoot, in stressing Clement's comprehensiveness seems to have placed the moralism of Clement in the middle ground between Paul and James. The Apostolic Fathers (Part 1): S. Clement of Rome, 2 vols., rev. ed., London and New York: Macmillan and Col, 1890, vol. 1, pp. 95-96. For the emphasis of election in 1 Clement see Charles Nielsen, "Clement of Rome and Moralism," Church History, 31, 1962, pp. 131, 146, 148.

[28] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "Hermas, Shepherd of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 583. Cf. F. L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1960, pp. 23-25; L. W. Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966, p. 154 (hereafter cited as Studies in Apostolic Fathers); idem, "The Shepherd of Hermas in Recent Study," Heythrop Journal, 9, 1968, pp. 30-32.

Though Hermas is in form an apocalypse, its content is not.[29] Rather than announcing a revelation of judgment which would bring salvation and glorification of the faithful, the central message of Hermas is an urgent call to penance for Christians who have fallen away and need a second chance in the face of an imminent and severe persecution. For only those Christians who are blameless before the Lord will escape the terrible judgment.[30]

Though Hermas exhibits a wide variety of sources, the consensus of many scholars is that it belongs in the milieu of Jewish Christianity.[31] J. Reiling, however, has recently argued from his investigation of the eleventh Mandate that the milieu "is predominantly hellenistic, though elements from sapiential and apocalyptic traditions are also present."[32] There are, in fact, two passages in Hermas which reflect Jewish traditions that were originally related to the land promise theme.

One passage contains the concept of the apocalyptic levelling.[33] In Vision I, 3. 4. God is presented as moving the heavens, mountains, hills and seas in order to make everything level for His elect so that He can fulfill the promise He made in fulness of glory and joy. Graydon Snyder's translation of this passage is as follows:

---

[29] Graydon F. Snyder, Apostolic Fathers, vol. 6, pp. 9-10; Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, p. 26.

[30] Cf. Shepherd, "Hermas, Shepherd of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 583; R. J. Bauckham, "The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas," Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., 25, 1974, p. 29.

[31] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 38-39; Lage Pernveden, The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas, Studia Theologica Lundensia, 27, trans. Ingrid and Nigel Reeves, Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966, p. 289 (hereafter cited as The Concept of the Church in Hermas). Barnard argued that Hermas has a Jewish background but that he was in close contact with Christian life in the Church at Rome at that time. Studies in Apostolic Fathers, pp. 157-163; cf., idem, "The Early Roman Church, Judaism, and Jewish Christianity," Anglican Theological Review, 49, 1967, pp. 371-384.

[32] Jannes Reiling, Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 37, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, p. 173.

[33] Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 106-108.

> Behold, the God of hosts [cf. Pss. 58:6; 79:5; 83:9, etc.], who has by his invisible and mighty power and by his great understanding created the world, and by his glorious will[34] clothes his creation with beauty, and by his mighty word fixed the heaven and established the earth upon waters [cf. Ps. 135:6], and by his own wisdom and providence created his holy church which also he blessed; behold, he is removing all the heavens and the mountains and the hills and the seas, and everything is becoming level for his elect in order that he might keep for them the promise which he made with great glory and joy, if they keep the commandments of God which they received in great faith.

While this passage, reflecting Isaiah 40:3 - 5, has been interpreted in Matthew 3:3 and John 1:23 as the Baptist's preparatory work for Christ, it conveys an image which often indicated the restoration of Israel to the land (Isaiah 35:6 - 10; 2 Isaiah 41:19; 51:13; Psalms 46:3). One of the clearest indications of this is in Deutero-Isaiah 49:8 - 13:

> Thus says the Lord: "In a time of favor I have answered you, in a day of salvation I have helped you; I have kept you and given you as a covenant to the people, to establish the land, to apportion the desolate heritages; saying to the prisoners, 'Come forth,' to those who are in darkness, 'Appear.' They shall feed along the ways, on all bare heights shall be their pasture; they shall not hunger or thirst, neither scorching wind nor sun shall smite them, for he who has pity on them will lead them, and by springs of water will guide them. And I will make all my mountains a way, and my highways shall be raised up. Lo, these shall come from afar, and lo, these from the north and from the west, and these from the land of Syene." Sing for joy, O heavens, and exult, O earth; break forth, O mountains, into singing! For the Lord has comforted his people, and will have compassion on his afflicted.

Again, the idea of the eschatological levelling is associated with the Day of Yahweh, when Yahweh Himself will fight for the restored Jerusalem

---

[34] "τῇ ἐνδοξῳ βουλῇ" or "ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ," [AE], Whittaker, Hirt des Hermas, p. 4. For the association of δόξα and βασιλεία in the sense of the saints reigning in glory but not used in 1 Clement 34:6 see Jan William Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, Assen: Van Gorcum and Co., -- G. A. Hak and Dr. H. J. Prakke, 1953, pp. 138, n. 2, 143-145, 150.

(Zechariah 14:10).[35]

Two other instances not only connect the eschatological levelling with the restoration of Israel to the promised land but also reflect the concept of the δόξα which is present in the Hermas passage. The first is 1 Baruch 5:7: "For God has ordered that every high mountain and the everlasting hills be made low and the valleys filled up, to make level ground, so that Israel may walk safely in the glory of God." The second passage is Psalms of Solomon 11:3 - 7. Here, again, both the eschatological levelling and the δόξα are associated with the restoration of Israel to Jerusalem. But while it is evident that the Hermas passage contains within it characteristics previously associated with the land promise theme, there is nothing to indicate that it has this significance as it now stands in the context of the first *Vision*. Indeed, even if one were to be so bold as to assume that the level plain of *Vision* I:1, 3 were the plain of *Similitude* IX 1, 4 on which the tower of the Church was built, no certain meaning could be ascertained as to the use of the land promise motif unless it were perhaps transcendentalized into the Church itself, similar to the concept of the New Temple as the Body of Christ.[36]

Another passage in Hermas reflects a tradition which was associated with the concept of the promised land in some of the Jewish literature. In *Vision* II. 4.1 the Church is discussed in connection with the creation of the world in order to assert that the Church was created prior to the world and stood as the eschatological goal of the world (*Vision* I. 6). Lage Pernveden deals with this passage in some detail. He points out that this concept in Hermas probably has its roots not in Valentinian Gnosticism which had the doctrine of emanation, but rather in both Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish sapiential tradition, with the Jewish influence predominating.[37] The passage is translated by Graydon Snyder as follows (Vision ii. 4, 1):

---

[35] Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, pp. 381-382.

[36] O'Hagan did identify the level plain of *Vision* I with that of *Similitude* IX and concluded that in Hermas there is the concept of the apocalyptic land for the elect. *Material Re-creation*, pp. 117-118. J. Ramsey Michaels pointed out that ὁμάλῶs in Hermas signified a place to be made clean. It was no fertile Paradise but the opposite which the Lord would transform. "The 'Level Ground' in the Shepherd of Hermas," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*, pp. 246, 248 - 249.

> As I was sleeping, brethren, a revelation was given to me by a handsome young man who said to me, 'That elderly lady, from whom you received the document, who do you think she is?' I said, 'The Sibyl.' 'You are mistaken,' said he, 'she is not.' 'Who then is she?' I said. 'The Church,' he said. I said to him, 'Why then is she elderly?' 'Because,' said he, 'she was created first of all; that is why she is elderly; and for her the world was made.'

The part of the passage which is important for this study is the phrase "and for her [the Church] the world was made." This concept, moreover, has its greatest affinity with the Jewish pseudepigraphic literature. Jean Daniélou believed that this concept should be directly linked with Palestinian Jewish apocalyptic and pointed to Fourth Ezra 7:11 as an example.[38] Indeed, the subject of the world created for the elect occurs in Fourth Ezra in a context which involved the idea of inheriting the world to come. The passage is as follows:

> If, now, this city be given to a man for an inheritance, unless the heir pass through the danger set before him, how shall he receive his inheritance? And I said: It is so, lord! Then said he unto me: Even so, also, is Israel's portion; for it was for their sakes I made the world; but when Adam transgressed my statutes, 'then that which had been made was judged, and then the ways of this world became narrow and sorrowful and painful (few and evil), and full of perils coupled with great toils. But the ways of the future world are broad and safe, and yield the fruit of immortality. If, then the living shall not have surely entered into these narrow and vain things, they will not be able to receive what has been reserved for them. (Fourth Ezra 7:10-15)

It should be noted, moreover, that the concept of inheriting the city as a simile for inheriting the future world also occurs in Hermas

---

[37] Pernveden, The Concept of the Church in Hermas, pp. 28-33.

[38] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, p. 294.

Similitude IX 12.5 (compare Matthew 7:13 ff.; 1 Clement 28:4). Yet, in Hermas these two ideas are not associated together. In fact, although this Jewish tradition occurs in literature which gives prominence to the concept of the promised land or the world as an inheritance of the elect, this tradition as to its territorial aspect is ignored in Hermas (cf. *Assumption of Moses* 1:11 ff.; 118 ff.; *Second Baruch* 14:18; 15:7; 21:24).

2 CLEMENT

Second Clement as a homily is primarily an exhortation or appeal to self control. The sermon is practical, insisting on good works, and its doctrinal points are presented in a way to encourage virtuous living.[39] Its tone is legalistic and Jewish-Christian, and its place of origin has been attributed to Corinth, Alexandria, and Rome. Recently Karl Donfried has advanced the thesis that 2 Clement was written near the end of the first century at Corinth by the presbyters who had been temporarily removed from office as a result of the schism in that Church.[40] This position, although it is persuasively argued, is not adopted here. Rather, a Roman provenance and a date near the middle of the second century seems more probable. This, however, cannot be maintained with certainty.

---

[39] Cf. M. H. Shepherd, Jr. "Clement, Epistles of," *IDB*, vol. 1, p. 649; Grant, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 44; Holt H. Graham, *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. R. M. Grant, vol. 2, p. 112; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, London: Macmillan and Co., (Part 1, S. Clement of Rome, 2 vols., 1890, Part 2 S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, 2d ed., 3 vols., 1889), Part 1, vol. 2, p. 194.

[40] Karl Paul Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 38, Leiden: E. J. Brill, p. 1-15 (hereafter cited as *Setting of Second Clement*). Mr. Donfried has essentially revised the arguments of Lightfoot in respect to (1) 2 Clement's relation to 1 Clement and (2) the use of the athletic Games and the world καταπλέω. See Lightfoot, the *Apostolic Fathers*, Part 1, vol. 2, pp. 197-202. The main difference involves the date of the homily. Donfried calls 2 Clement "hortatory address," *Setting of Second Clement*, p. 1. F. L. Cross, on the basis of Lightfoot's presentation, argued for either a Roman or a Corinthian origin. *The Early Christian Fathers*, p. 14. Dibelius argued for Rome with some reservations, *N. T. and Early Christian Literature*, pp. 204-205.

RESURRECTION

Though Karl Donfried identifies chapters 15 through 18 as the eschatological section of 2 Clement,[41] passages which contain eschatological and apocalyptic elements occur throughout the homily, and are particularly related to sober watchfulness in light of the expected judgment. The first passage for consideration deals with the resurrection of the flesh. The use of σάρξ instead of σῶμα is probably meant to emphasize the materiality of resurrection.[42] The passage is as follows (9:1 - 6):

> Further, let none of you say that this flesh is not judged nor does it rise again. Consider: in what state you were saved, in what state did you regain your sight, if it was not in this flesh? Hence it is necessary to guard the flesh as the temple of God. For as in the flesh you were called, in the flesh you will come. If Christ the Lord who saved us was first spirit but became flesh and in that state called us, so we also shall receive our reward in this flesh. Let us therefore love one another, so that we may all enter the kingdom of God.

If we assume the emphasis on the materiality of the resurrection, the reason for this emphasis is what deserves consideration. Although it is possible that the phrase "in the flesh you will come" is meant to be understood in terms of "entering the kingdom of God" so that a material resurrection will partake of the material messianic kingdom, it is not likely. Indeed, this sense does not present itself with any certainty. In fact, the element of the material resurrection seems to be used for quite another purpose.[43]

---

[41] Donfried, *Setting of Second Clement*, pp. 166-181.

[42] Cf. the discussion of the resurrection of the body by John A. T. Robinson. "Resurrection in the NT," *IDB*, vol. 4, p. 50, sec. 1, b.

[43] The purpose is given in 9:6, "Let us therefore love one another, so that we may all enter the kingdom of God." Cf. 1 Clement 23-27; Donfried, *Setting of Second Clement*, p. 12; Graham; *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Grant, pp. 120-121; Shepherd "Clement, Epistles of," IDB, vol. 1, p. 649, sec. 2.

UMI

The threat of Proto-Gnostic and Gnostic spirituality, particularly as it related to the resurrection was very real in the first two centuries.[44] Accordingly, if these influences were present in the author's church, it would be appropriate to counter this influence with an emphasis on the orthodox view of the resurrection. In fact, Oscar Cullmann has indicated the nature of the problem of the concept of resurrection for the Greek world. For one need go no further than the concept of the immortality of the soul alone, to find a view which made problematic the acceptance of the resurrection of the flesh:

> Thus in Athens there was no laughter until Paul spoke of the resurrection (Acts 17:32). Both the people of whom Paul says (in 1 Thessalonians 4:13) that 'they have no hope' and those of whom he writes (in 1 Corinthians 15:12) that they do not believe there is a resurrection from the dead are probably not Epicureans, as we are inclined to believe. Even those who believe in the immortality of the soul do not have the hope of which Paul speaks, the hope which expresses the belief of a divine miracle of new creation which will embrace everything, every part of the world created by God. Indeed for the Greeks who believed in the immortality of the soul it may have been harder to accept the Christian preaching of the resurrection than it was for others. About the year 150 Justin (in his Dialogue, 80) writes of people, 'who say that there is no resurrection from the dead, but that immediately at death their souls would ascend to heaven.' Here the contrast is indeed clearly perceived.[45]

Rather than using this apocalyptic element to reflect the tradition of the messianic kingdom on earth, the writer has employed this element to affirm that the flesh will be raised in resurrection. It is therefore necessary to guard the flesh as the temple of God because the flesh will be judged. In fact, the very absence of an emphasis on a material messianic kingdom is a good indication that the writer did not accept this tradition or consider it very important. For this concept of the kingdom would only serve to heighten the emphasis of the materiality as it regards the resurrection. Instead, the writer uses the ethical tone to pursue virtue.

---

[44] Robert A. Kraft, "Apostolic Fathers," IDBS, p. 36. Gunther, St. Paul's Opponents, pp. 290-317; Klijn and Reinink, Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian Sects, pp. 3-110.

[45] Oscar Cullmann, Immortality of the Soul: or Resurrection of the Dead: The Witness of the New Testament, London: Epworth, 1958, p. 59. Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., who pointed out Hellenistic influences in the Hebrew concept of resurrection. "Future Life in Intertestamental Literature," IDBS, pp. 349-350, sec. 3, pars. 1-2. This article is largely a condensation of Nickelsburg's Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, Harvard Theological Studies, 26, Cambridge and London: Harvard Universtiy Press and Oxford University Press, 1972.

The second passage for consideration in 2 Clement contains the element of judgment and the gathering together of the elect:

> But try to come here more frequently and make progress in the commandments of the Lord, that all "with a common mind" may be gathered into life. For the Lord said, "I am coming to gather all nations, peoples and tongues." This refers to the day of his appearing when He will come to redeem us, each according to his deeds (17:5).

This eschatological element has many parallels in the Jewish sources, the tradition reflected in the element of the gathering together of the elect has its basis in the Old Testament, and is carried on in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Philo, the rabbinic wirtings, the Gospels, and the prayers of the Jewish synagogue.[46] Examples of this theme are found in Psalm 147:2; Tobit 13:5; Baruch 5:5; 2 Maccabees 1:27; 2 Baruch 78:7; and 1 Enoch 90:33 which definitely associate a future gathering of the elect with the messianic kingdom. Here, however, in spite of the apocalyptic element and the connection elsewhere in Jewish literature with the messianic kingdom, the Trito-Isaiah passage which is quoted is used in terms of the New Age, and not the temporary kingdom. Further, for the writer, the Dispersion of Israel has become the Church which is dispersed throughout the world, and awaits the coming judgment at which time there will be new heavens and a new earth (16:3; 17:5-7). It is true, as George Ladd has pointed out, that the active gathering together of the elect is a type with an eschatological significance in regard to the passive gathering together of the parousia; and this often indicates that the temporary kingdom of the Messiah would follow.[47] But this was not always the case. For sometimes the New Age followed [cf. Assumption of Moses 10:1-10]. Again, the eschatology reflected here is not in reference to a messianic kingdom, but rather in reference to the judgment and the Age to Come. If anything, the temporary kingdom with the land promise theme is rejected as to its territorial aspect.

---

[46] McKelvey, New Temple, pp. 20-40; Cohn, Pursuit of the Millennium. pp. 21-23.

The third subject which merits attention in regard to our theme is the nature of the coming kingdom. Three passages in fact indicate the eschatological tradition that the writer associated with this concept. The passages are 2 Clement 5:5, 12:1-2, and 17:5.

The first passage in chapter five is set in the context of an exhortation to the faithful not to be concerned about leaving this world. The passage is as follows:

> You must realize, brethren, that our stay in this world of the flesh is slight and short, but the promise of Christ is great and wondrous, even rest in the kingdom to come and in life eternal (5:5).

The contrast seems to be between the present evil age and the transhistorical Age to Come. The elements of both a promised rest and the coming kingdom are present, but not in the sense nor in the scheme of Revelation, chapter 20. In the Revelation a promise is given to the victorious saints that they should reign with Christ in the messianic kingdom, after which follows the New Age. Here, however, this life in this world of the flesh is contrasted to the promised rest in the coming kingdom which is presented as the New Age in life eternal. This is a scheme which follows more closely that of 2 Baruch 29:1-30:5 in which the apocalyptic concept of the Two Ages is clearly presented as the age of this world and the transhistorical Age to Come.

The second passage in 2 Clement 12:1-4 reflects the Jewish speculation about the "when" of the coming Messiah (Acts 1:6-8; 3:19-22), but the quasi-gnostic answer from the Gospel of the Egyptians (?) makes it highly improbable that there is any traditional apocalyptic or eschatological force behind the idea of "when." Rather, the context changes the concept of when in the sense of an eschatological timetable into the sense of a how, i.e. "we are to be on the watch for the kingdom, knowing that when we are sufficiently purified, it will come."[48]

---

[47] George E. Ladd, The Blessed Hope, reprint, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970, pp. 20-21. Cf. Colin Brown, who pointed out the ambiguity of the word. It does not always have an eschatological force. "μαρανάθα," New International Dictionary, vol. 2, pp. 896-898.

In the last passage we wish to consider concerning the coming kingdom, the English is not very clear, but the passage is as follows (17:5):

> And the unbelievers shall see his glory and might, and they will be astonished to see that sovereignty over the world belongs to Jesus ...(ἰδόντες τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ κόσμου ἐν τῶ Ἰησοῦ).

That the Greek word translates "sovereignty" has the force of "kingdom" is supported not only by the context but also by the phrase τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ θεοῦ translated "kingdom of God" in 2 Clement 6:9. Here, again, the kingdom that Christ ushers in is that of the New Age which immediately follows the day of judgment.[49]

In 2 Clement both the apocalyptic elements of the judgment and gathering together of the elect and the judgment and coming of the kingdom are presented in the scheme of the Two Ages. This present age of wickedness is contrasted to the Age to Come, in which those who are faithful are promised rest in eternal life. Further, the coming judgment and kingdom are presented in such a way as to motivate Christians to a life of self control and good works. The concept, therefore, of the land-promise theme is not present in 2 Clement, and is probably altogether foreign to the personal eschatology of the writer.

JUDE

Scholarship is divided on the question of pseudonymity in the case of Jude. There are, to be sure, certain reasons which could indicate that Jude is an authentic composition of the first century. It is probable that the first verse is meant to identify the author as Judas, the brother of James and of the Lord (Jude 1; James 1:1; Galatians 1:19; Mark 6:3). If this were a pseudonym, it would be curious that such a relatively unknown personality would have been chosen. Further, the fact that such a short letter is saturated with the imagery, terminology, and traditions of the Old Testament and the Jewish pseudepigraphic literature could point to a Palestinian or first century Jewish origin. The lack of reference, moreover, to persecution, the Jewish war of 66-70, or the destruction of the Temple could favor a date well within the first century, possibly as John Robinson has recently argued, in the early sixties.[50] Yet, there are serious difficulties in placing the origin of this letter earlier than the late first century.

---

[48] Cf. Graham, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Grant, vol. 2, p. 123. It is unlikely that the apocryphal saying in 2 Clement 12.2 is dependent on either the Gospel of the Egyptians or the Gospel of Thomas. See Donfried, Setting of Second Clement, pp. 73-77; Jacques-E. Ménard, "Thomas, Gospel of," IDBS, pp. 902-903; George W. MacRae, "Nag Hammadi," IDBS, pp. 617-619. Contrary to the judgment of Graham, Wilhelm Schneemelcher assumed an ambiguous stand on this point. New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, p. 169.

[49] George Ladd, Presence of the Future, pp. 122-148; Berthold Klappert, "βασιλέια," New International Dictionary, pp. 372-390; Robert M. Grant, Early Christian Society: Seven Studies, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1977, p. 20, n. 34.

Scholars have pointed to the linguistic argument as a strong reason to assume a late and non-Palestinian origin of Jude. The salutation form is close to those of 1 and 2 Timothy, 2 John, and the Martyrdom of Polycarp.[51] Second John probably originated in the last decade of the first century or first decade of the second century, and though some would date the Pastorals before A.D. 70, most scholars would place these writings in the second century with confidence.[52] Further, the relatively cultivated use of Hellenistic Greek and the use of a Greek translation of Jewish material such as 1 Enoch, as Werner Kummel argues, has been considered reason for a second century date.[53] It is true, however, that the issue of the use of relatively good Greek is being reevaluated for the significance this has in determining the possibile early and Jewish origin of certain Christian writings.[54] Although it has been recently discovered that an Aramaic version of 1 Enoch may have been available to our author, in light of the studies of John Sevenster and A. W. Argyle, our author may have deliberately chosen the medium of Greek -- and therefore made use of a Greek translation -- to communicate to his readers.[55] A. W. Argyle's position is that the linguistic argument can no longer be used with confidence and that the evidence indicates that the purpose of the Church was missionary from the outset. The only reasonable course to take then, was to write the message in Greek. Yet, this has not been demonstrated.[56]

---

[50] Redating the New Testament, pp. 196-198.

[51] J. Christian Becker, "Jude, Letter of," IDB, vol. 2, sec. 2, c.

[52] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The First Letter of John" and "The Second Letter of John," Interpreters 1-Vol. Commentary, pp. 935-936 and 940. Bo Reicke places the letter between A.D. 90-95. James, Peter, and Jude, pp. 192, 203.

[53] Kummel, INT, p. 428.

Other reasons, in fact, argue for a second century date of Jude. The concept of "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints" seems to be, as Claude Thompson suggests, more appropriate to a later time such as the second century.[57] This is especially true when one considers the reference to the apostles in verses 17 and 18.[58] It would seem that the author considers himself living in the last times of which the apostles made predictions concerning the current problem of scoffers and heretics. Indeed, though it is probably impossible to identify the heretics combatted in Jude,[59] the problems of Judaising forms of Christianity, Docetism, and Gnosticism were especially difficult in the later part of the first and the first half of the second centuries, especially in Asia Minor, a likely candidate for the destination of the letter.[60] Finally, if there is dependence on James (Jude 1; James 1:1) and if Jude was incorporated into 2 Peter, Jude's concept of Christianity in credal terms similar to the Didache, Barnabas and Hermas points to a date within the first half of the second century, and perhaps Rome as the place of writing. Though nothing is certain concerning the place of composition, the fact that Jude was recognized as canonical by Clement of Alexandria (Miscellanies iii.2) Tertullian (Apparel of Women 1.3) and the Muratorian Fragment, favors a Roman origin.[61]

---

[54] Kümmel rejected Sevenster's theses: "Sevenster's evidence that the Greek language was much used in Palestine at that time and could be learned does not prove that a Jew whose mother tongue was Aramaic could normally write literary Greek." INT, p. 412. But Kümmel probably misrepresents Sevenster on this point. See Sevenster, Do You Know Greek?, p. 189. Again Argyle argues that there is evidence that a Jewish merchant would have spoken Greek. "Greek in New Testament Times," p. 88.

[55] Cf. Turner, Grammatical Insights into the New Testament, pp. 174-175, 181, 185, 187. On the Greek translation of the Aramaic 1 Enoch see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran," Theological Studies, 38, 1977, pp. 337-339 (hereafter cited as "New Enoch Literature"). Cf. J. T. Milik, with the collaboration of Matthew Black, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1976, pp. 70-73 (hereafter cited as Books of Enoch).

[56] Argyle,"Greek in New Testament Times," p. 89.

[57] Claude Holmes Thompson, "The Book of Jude," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 942.

[58] Kümmel, INT, p. 428.

---

[59] J. Christian Beker, "Jude, Letter of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 1010, sec. 3; cf. F. F. Bruce, "Jude, Epistle of," The New Bible Dictionary, ed. J. D. Douglas, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 10th reprint, 1977, p. 675.

[60] Albert E. Barnett, introduction and exegesis of "The Epistle of Jude," IB, vol. 12, p. 318, sec. 11. Cf. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Gospel According to John," Interpreters 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 708; Douglas J. Rowston, "The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 21, 1975, pp. 555 ff. (hereafter cited as "Most Neglected Book").

[61] Albert C. Sundberg, Jr. has recently argued against a second century New Testament canon and a Roman origin of the Muratorian Fragment. His arguments are based mainly on the ambiguity of "urbs" in line 38, the inferred date in respect to the Shepherd of Hermas, and the inclusion of several apocryphal works probably originating in the East. See "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon," in Studia Evangelica, 6, TU, vol. 102, ed. F. L. Cross, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968, p. 458; idem, "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List," Harvard Theological Review, 66, 1973, pp. 6-9, 24-41. Sundberg's arguments, though persuasive, have not overturned the Roman origin of the Muratorian Fragment. George Edmundson's opinion that it was Roman and originated between 185 and 200 still stands as a view representative of the majority of scholars. Church in Rome, p. 209. It could be added that in spite of Clement of Alexandria's use, Eusebius doubted its authenticity in Ecclesiastical History, vi, 14, 1.

The author wrote this letter in order to denounce certain heretics who had managed to gain admission into the fellowship of the Church. The author, moreover, considered the situation to be of such urgency that he interrupted (the force of σπουδή)[62] the composition of a treatise on the common salvation in order to pen the present exhortation to contend for the faith once for all entrusted to the saints. Further, in his effort to discredit the teaching and example of these heretics, the author referred to several Jewish traditions and sources in which the theme of promised blessing in the land was of some importance. What is significant for this study, is the fact that in spite of the author's use of material which at times gives singular prominence to this theme of promised blessing in the land, he ignores this theme altogether in his manifesto.

THE MOSAIC-EXODUS TRADITION

In verse five, there is a reference to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and the subsequent wandering in the wilderness before entry into the promised land. This tradition was used in different ways. One way focused on this tradition in such a manner as to provide the elect with a basis for hope of a secure place of blessing in the future. In JEDP the emphasis was on the dynamic of promise -- whether conditional or unconditional -- and fulfillment. In Hosea, the element of the wilderness period was used in order to show how God would prepare Israel once again for blessing in the land. In Hebrews, the example of sojourning in the wilderness is used to drive home the point that the believer must persevere in faith if he is to attain entry into the promised rest. In Hebrews the goal of the promised land has been transformed into that of a sabbath rest for the people of God (4:9). Thus, though the goal has been redefined -- eternal salvation and rest after the trials of this wilderness of life -- it is the same promise which endures.

Another way this tradition was used, however, did not emphasize the exodus events as a basis for hope of blessing in the future in any eschatological or apocalyptic sense. Indeed, Paul focussed on the wilderness period in order to demonstrate that both faith and moral responsibility were required in the life of a Christian (1 Corinthians 10:1 ff.). By assuming the Corinthian Christians were part of the true Israel and by using the principle of typology, Paul taught that Christians just as the Israelite fathers, could not rely exclusively on baptism, the eucharist, and participation in the body of Christ as a means of staying in God's favor. For although the fathers experienced these spiritual realities, most of them fell into moral laxity and apostacy, and were consequently overthrown in the wilderness. Indeed, in spite of the fact that Paul believed the Christians were living in the last days (10:11), he did not mention any eschatological or apocalyptic goal. Rather, this tradition is used to demonstrate that a Christian's faith must result in good moral behavior especially in respect to the question of partaking of the cup and table of the Lord and the cup and table of demons (10:20-22). There is, to be sure, a danger of reading too automatically an apocalyptic goal into a tradition which is so frequently pointing in that direction. Indeed, it would seem that the exegesis of Clarence Craig would be inappropriate in this context: "Before entrance into the promised land at the parousia of Christ, the new Israel must also pass through a time of testing in the heathen world."[63] On the contrary, what is significant is that the aspect of an apocalyptic goal has no place in this context.

---

[62] Henry Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. 4, p. 530.

This is also the situation in Jude. Although there is a clear reference to a tradition which was often charged with national eschatological and apocalyptic hope, the tradition is used in such a way as to provide a basis to assume that God will destroy those who fall into disobedience and unbelief.[64]

Jude reflects the use of the Assumption of Moses, a pseudepigraphic work in which the subject of promised blessing in the land is an important theme. The book was probably written by a Palestinian Jew before A.D. 30 and during the lifetime of Jesus.[65] In the book, there is no expectation of a Messiah, but there is the expectation of the restoration of the Dispersion, the establishment of the theocratic kingdom, during which the Gentiles would be destroyed, and a final destiny of enjoyment in heaven.[66] Further, these hopes were based on the covenant and oath, both Mosaic and Abrahamic, in which God promised to bless Israel in the land (1:8 ff.; 2:1 ff.; 3:9-14; 4:5 ff.; 11:10-19; 12:31). Indeed, while the promise of the land is repeatedly indicated as that of Canaan, in at least two passages it is implied that the entire world is really Israel's possession (1:11 ff.; 11:8 ff.). It is true, as Martin Rist points out, that the righteous, as in Daniel 12:1 ff., would ultimately experience an "astral immortality" in heaven and not on the earth.[67] Yet, throughout the book, the theme of promised blessing in the land as an apocalyptic hope of Israel receives singular prominence.

---

[63] Clarence T. Craig, "First Corinthians," IB, vol. 10, p. 107.

[64] Rowston argued against the present writer's position. He stated that five elements allow Jude to be classified as Jewish-Christian apocalyptic: 1) pseudonymity; 2) angelology; 3) demonology; nature symbolism; 4) predicted calamities; 5) and a Messianic figure. "Most Neglected Book," p. 561.

When we come to the author's use of the Assumption of Moses, however, we find no reflection of this theme. In the two passages, verses 9 and 16, which show dependence on the Assumption, only those aspects of the Assumption are used which impugn the heretics and help to characterize and condemn them as irreverant and immoral. There is no concern with the theme of promised blessing in the land, but rather with the immediate problem of those whose impiety, licentiousness, and false doctrine were a very real threat to those of the orthodox faith.

JUDE'S USE OF 1 ENOCH

In another passage (14-15), Jude reflects the use of another pseudepigraph which is of considerable importance for our study, 1 Enoch.

---

[65] Martin Rist, "Moses, Assumption of," IDB, vol. 3, p. 451, sec. b, c; Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of O.T., vol. 2, p. 411.

[66] Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of O.T., vol. 2, p. 412.

[67] Rist, "Moses, Assumption of," IDB, vol. 3, p. 451, sec. f.

Because of the discovery of Aramaic fragments of this literature in Cave 4 of Qumran, more light has been shed on the five parts of 1 Enoch.

It now seems probable that 1 Enoch began with the Astronomical Book as an Aramaic composition near the end of the third century B.C. and received a pentateuchal form by the first century B.C.[68] It is significant that in the Qumran fragments there is no representation of the Book of Parables, which part alone contains the figure described as Messiah, Elect One, Righteous One and Son of Man. It seems probable, moreover, that the earlier compilation of 1 Enoch had a part designated the Book of Giants instead of the Book of Parables. Because of this, J. T. Milik has argued that the Book of Parables was a Christian Greek composition -- dependant on the New Testament -- and was later substituted for the Book of Giants.[69] Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, however, is convinced that Milik's conclusion is not yet substantiated by the evidence -- a weakness being an argument from silence -- and that what now seems probable is that "at some point in the Christian era the Book of Parables was substituted for the Book of Giants."[70]

First Enoch is significant not only for the prominence it gives to our theme of promised blessing in the land and other often related themes such as the repentance of Israel and the messianic kingdom, but also for the immense popularity it enjoyed, influencing theological ideas into the second century.[71] This influence, moreover, in respect to our theme may be seen in such books as Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, the Synoptics, the Revelation, 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, and Barnabas. All of these books to a greater or lesser degree show evidence of a concern for the concept of the promise of the land as a basis for an eschatological or apocalyptic hope. Indeed, while it is true that 1 Enoch as a composite book often lacks unity and even possesses conflicting views on its theological subjects, the concept advanced concerning the significance of the promise of land is remarkably consistant. (1 Enoch 5:7; 10:18 ff.; 25:5-7; 45:1-6; 48:8-10; 51:5; 56:6-7; 60:7-10; 61:12; 62:6-9, contrast 5:7; 63:1-65:12; 90:28-34; 93:1-10; 91:12-14; 108:1-4).[72]

---

[68] Milik, Books of Enoch, pp. 4-58; Fitzmeyer, "New Enoch Literature," Theological Studies, 38, 1977, 334, 337-339.

[69] Milik, Books of Enoch, pp. 73-75.

[70] Fitzmeyer, "New Enoch Literature," p. 342.

[71] Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of O.T., vol. 2, pp. 176-185; Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., The Old Testament of the Early Church, Harvard Theological Studies, 20, 1964, Cambridge, Massachussetts and London England: Harvard University Press, pp. 162-163. Louis Ginsberg took a more cautious position in respect to the influence of 1 Enoch in the second century. Ginsberg attributed the enduring but limited influence to the apocalyptic-minded Rabbi Akiba from the school of Jabneh. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings," Journal of Biblical Literature, 41, 1922. This would explain why Akiba was not successful in involving the whole Pharisaic movement in the rebellion of Simeon bar Kosiba. Akiba, in fact, was ridiculed for his messianic expectations by Johanan ben Tortha. See Michael Grant, Jews in the Roman World, p. 250. These last two

That Jude, unlike the other literature just mentioned, does not reflect this theme is remarkable, unless this theme as such is unimportant or irrelevant to the author. This seems especially true since the author does not refrain from portraying the condemnation of the wicked in the apocalyptic imagery of 1 Enoch. These heretics are "wandering stars for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved forever (v. 13; cf. 1 Enoch 18:12-16)." Moreover, it is not unlikely that their doom is additionally pictured as the apocalyptic fire (v. 23) which in 1 Enoch is destined for both the fallen angels and the accursed at the messianic judgment (1 Enoch 21:1-10; 23:1-4; 27:1-5). In contrast, however, there is no apocalyptic imagery of the messianic kingdom or even the motif of the land-promise transformed into a heavenly Canaan for the elect. Rather, the reward of the elect is simply the "mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life"(v. 21; cf. Titus 2:13).

---

points should modify the evaluation of Leonhard Goppelt that behind the three insurrections of the Jews between A.D. 66 and A.D. 135 stood a conscious expectation of a Messiah. Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times, trans. Robert A. Guelich, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970, p. 117.

[72] Though apocalyptic may have diminished in Judaism, the importance of the land did not. See Samuel Safrai, "The Relationship between the Dispersion and the Land of Israel," Jewish People in First Century, pp. 184 ff. In some instances there was an effort to make life in exile as if it were life in the Holy Land. See Michael Grant, Jews in the Roman World, p. 279. Further, it is noteworthy that Jude does not reflect the tradition in the Pirkē Aboth as Albert Barnett has pointed out. "The Epistle of Jude," IB, vol. 12, pp. 330-331. In the Pirkē Aboth 5:22 the wicked that are like Balaam will inherit Gehenna, but the disciples of Abraham will inherit the Garden of Eden and the world to come. The answer of

It may be concluded, therefore, that the concept of promised blessing in the land as the hope of the elect is not present in Jude. There is, in fact, in spite of the use of a number of Jewish and Jewish apocalyptic sources which present the blessing and salvation in terms of this tradition, not the least indication that the author held this view.

2 PETER

It is probable that Second Peter is a pseudononymous composition of the second century.[73] Several reasons, moreover, suggest a date within the second quarter of the second century: dependence on Jude; the presupposition of a collection of the letters of Paul as scripture (3:15-16); the probability that some time had elapsed since the first generation of Christians (3:4 ff.); the likelihood that the heretics combatted were second century Gnostics, (3:16); and the fact that there is not even an implicit reference to Second Peter prior to Origen (Commentary on John 5:3).[74]

The place of composition is unknown. Indeed, Werner Kümmel indicates that "Rome is only a guess."[75] Yet, several reasons could point to Rome: the author's attitude to Paul and Peter (3:15 with 1 Clement 5:3-6:1); the reference to First Peter (3:1); and the possible allusion to the Gospel of Mark (1:15; cf. 1 Peter 5:13).[76]

A. C. Leaney seems to be a likely explanation. Jude was interested in avoiding temptation altogether. Letter of Peter and Jude, pp. 91-92.

[73] Kümmel, INT, pp. 429-434. There is no unanimity among scholars even here. John Robinson suggested for serious consideration that Jude wrote 2 Peter early in the first century for Peter. Redating the New Testament, p. 195. Bo Riecke dates 2 Peter about A.D. 90. James, Peter, and Jude, p. 144.

[74] The reference in Eusebius in respect to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria is unclear. Ecclesiastical History, VI.14, 1. Likewise the references in Cassiodorus' Institutiones Divinarum et Saecularium Letterarum seems contradictory or unclear. See Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. 4, p. 150.

[75] Kümmel, INT, p. 434. Claude H. Thompson suggested Rome, Palestine or Asia Minor. "The Second Letter of Peter," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 931.

[76] Albert E. Barnett, introduction and exegesis to "The Second Epistle of Peter," IB, vol. 12, p. 164.

The purpose of the letter was to strengthen the readers in sound doctrine (3:17-18) and to combat the false teaching of the heretics regarding both the second advent of Christ and the misuse of the teaching of Paul (3:4, 16). The promises are sure but require a virtuous life and the proper use of gnosis according to the apostolic testimony (chapter one). Indeed, the second coming of Christ is presented as a fact that should encourage godly living because with it the eternal kingdom begins.

In this letter, there are two verses which, when considered together, indicate that the concept of promised blessing in the land has been transformed into the hope of a transhistorical kingdom in the Age to Come -- a concept similar to that of Second Clement.

An aspect of the promises mentioned in 1:4 is identified in 3:13 as the promise of new heavens and a new earth. Juan Alfaro understands this passage as an indication that the promise of the land remained "something to which Christians must look for."[77] Further, Alfaro seems to imply the relative spiritualization of this concept freed Christians from the hope of a particular land (Canaan) and enabled them to share the earth in a way that would be reminiscent of the new earth. This sense, however, does not really seem to be present in Second Peter. Rather, as is the case in Second Clement, this life in this world and its corruption is contrasted with life that partakes of the divine nature in the Age to Come (1:4; 3:4-14).[78] Moreover, the fact that the reference is clearly to Third Isaiah (65:17; 66:22) where there is the notion of the Two Ages (65:17-25) points in this direction.

In conclusion, therefore, Second Peter presents a situation very similar to Second Clement. The second coming and the promise of new heavens and a new earth are presented in such a way as to encourage godly living and a firm adherence to the apostolic faith. This world is contrasted with the world to come, and the new world is the heavenly kingdom of God in which righteousness dwells.

---

[77] Alfaro, "The Land -- Stewardship," p. 61.

[78] The concept of material recreation in terms of the Two Ages is present in 2 Peter 2:6 ff. and 3:6 ff. See Lewis, Interpretation of the Flood, pp. 105, 168-169; O'Hagan, Material Re-Creation, p. 3.

CHAPTER 2

SYRIA-PALESTINE

Two documents which probably or certainly were compositions of Syria-Palestinian Christianity are of very different types -- James, and the letters of Ignatius. Although they differ in respect to the Jewish, Hellenistic, and apocalyptic elements they contain, neither exhibits a clear indication that the concept of the promised land was an apocalyptic hope which they cherished.

JAMES

James is probably a pseudonymous composition, paraenetic in nature, dating from the end of the first or the beginning of the second century.[1] Because there is a lack of reference to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus and because the name of Christ appears in only two passages where, if removed, the sense would not be seriously affected, some scholars have supposed a Jewish author.[2] Other features of the letter, however, point to a Christian author, perhaps even a Jewish Christian author who was also familiar with Hellenistic traditions,[3] some of the letters of Paul, and the Gospel of Matthew, parallels of which, as Massey Shepherd, Jr. has pointed out, "relate to every single section of the Epistle, and to almost every major theme."[4] As to the letter's place of composition, Werner Kümmel designates "any place in Eastern Jewish Christianity" as possible,[5] although early Syria-Palestinian attestation and the influence of Matthew, as Massey Shepherd, Jr. has

---

[1] Kümmel, INT, p. 414; Richard L. Scheef, Jr., "The Letter of James," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 917; Burton Scott Easton, introduction and exegesis to "The Epistle of James," IB, vol. 12, p. 15.

[2] Cf. Kümmel, INT, pp. 404-405; Robinson, Redating the New Testament, pp. 118-121.

[3] Robert M. Grant in respect to James has argued that "Greek literature was studied by Jews in Jerusalem" early in the first century. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament, New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 222. Cf. Roy Bower Ward, "James, Letter of," IDBS, p. 469, sec. 1.

[4] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew," Journal of Biblical Literature, 75, 1956, p. 41 (hereafter cited as "James and Matthew").

[5] Kümmel, INT, p. 414.

UMI

argued, point to Syria-Palestine.[6]

There is only one passage of significance to our theme, but it is a difficult one. This is in part due to the nature and purpose of the letter itself. The fact that James stands in the tradition of Judaeo-Christian wisdom literature such as the Wisdom of Solomon, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Manual of Discipline, and the fact that the letter seems to be designed for a broad group of readers and not for any specific crisis are reasons for considerably different evaluations of its theology. The single reference for our consideration is in 2:5:

> Listen, my beloved brethren. Has not God chosen those who are poor in the world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which he has promised to those who love him?[7]

The passage clearly reflects the blessing of the poor (Matthew 5:3; Luke 6:20). Further, the kingdom which is promised can best be understood as the future kingdom of God in which the poor will experience the promised blessing (cf. 5:6).

Indeed, there are features in the letter which could point to an understanding of the kingdom of God in terms of a messianic kingdom. For the Church is designated as the twelve tribes -- i.e. spiritual

---

[6] Shepherd, "James and Matthew," p. 49.

[7] Reicke seems to take this verse in the sense of 1 Peter 1:4. James, Peter and Jude, pp. 27-28. An interesting parallel to this passage in James is The Teachings of Silvanus (VII, 4), introduced and trans. Malcolm Peel and Jan Zandee, ed. Frederik Wisse, in The Nag Hammadi Library in English, ed. James M. Robinson, New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, and London: Harper and Row (hereafter this volume cited as Nag Hammadi Library). According to Malcolm Peel and Jan Zandee The Teachings of Silvanus is in the literary genre of Jewish Wisdom literature. The author speaks of Christ as the heir of all things (par. 101, p. 354), describes the victorious saints as clothed in wisdom like a robe, and knowledge as a crown (par. 89, p. 349). One passage seems to affirm the land-promise theme in the Davidic tradition: "Keep the holy commandments of Jesus Christ, and you will reign over every place on earth and will be honored by the angels and archangels." (Par. 91, p. 350). Yet it is not clear in this work whether or not the reigning is a spiritual one. Cf. R. B. Ward, "James, Letter of," IDBS, p. 470 on the eschatological expectation of James.

Israel -- which is scattered throughout the world. This could reflect the apocalyptic notion of the gathering together of the elect which we discussed concerning Second Clement 17:5. Moreover, the fact that the author refers to Abraham as "our father" and believes the second coming is near (5:8) may be an indication the author expected the Church as the spiritual descendants of Abraham was about to inherit the promise of blessing in the land in terms of the promised kingdom of God. To be sure, the terminology and allusions are tantalizing: the twelve tribes scattered throughout the world; Abraham as our father; blessing in the promised kingdom of which the poor are heirs. Yet, there is no clear indication that this particular understanding of these various elements is the one intended.

These elements, it should be noted, are not put together in a way that points toward this interpretation. Unlike Paul, who discusses most of these subjects in a single context (Romans 4; Galatians 3-4), in James, these topics are scattered throughout a series of homiletic discourses with each discourse having its own special theme. Further, these elements are used by the author in respect to the individual theme of each particular discourse.[8] In the greeting the reference to the scattered tribes is probably used to designate the true Israel as the entire Church (cf. Galatians 6:16; Philippians 3:3; 1 Peter 1:1, 17; 2:10 ff.; Revelation 7:4, Hermas, Similitude IX. 17:1). The inheritance of the kingdom is used to encourage better treatment of the poor inasmuch as they were heirs of blessing in the kingdom. The concept of Abraham as our father is used in a way similar to that in 1 Clement 10. By both faith and works we prove that we are the spiritual descendants of Abraham. Finally, the fact that the second coming of the Lord is near should encourage patience in godly living. Therefore, the reference to the promise of blessing in the kingdom without a clearer qualification cannot be determined as referring to a messianic kingdom in which the territorial aspect of the promised land would be present.

---

[8] Shepherd, "James and Matthew," pp. 41-47.

IGNATIUS

The genuine letters of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, were written while the author was being taken to Rome as a condemned prisoner.[9] Further, the date of composition may be determined with a good degree of probability inasmuch as Ignatius' martyrdom occurred in the reign of Trajan, probably "within a few years of A.D. 110, before or after."[10] These letters bear witness to the fact that Ignatius strongly supported the governance of the churches according to the hierarchy of the three-fold orders of the Church.[11] Indeed, Ignatius believed that all essential functions of the churches required the permission of the bishop. Moreover, these letters indicate that at least some of the churches in Asia were undergoing the threat of heresy in a form both Jewish and Docetic.[12]

---

[9] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "Ignatius, Epistles of," IDB, vol. 2, pp. 678-679.

[10] J. B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers: Part 2, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, 3 vols., 2d rev. ed., London and New York: Macmillan and Company, 1889, p. 30 (hereafter cited as Apostolic Fathers: Part 2).

[11] Shepherd, "Ignatius, Epistles of," IDB, vol. 3, p. 679. Jack W. Hannah proposed that the redactor of the Ignatian long recension was an admirer of Paul. "The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension," Journal of Biblical Literature, 79, 1960, p. 238.

[12] The identification of the heretics combatted by Ignatius is a difficult one. Robert Grant seems to imply a "two-front war" -- one against Judaizers and the other against Docetists (some of whom perhaps were affected by ideas like those of Saturninus). Apostolic Fathers, vol. 4, pp. 22 ff. It is not inconceivable that later forms of Eionitism which denied the Virgin Birth and lived according to the Law were involved in some of the heresies Ignatius combatted. See Klijn and Reinink, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects, p. 43, n. 2. Massey Shepherd earlier seemed to agree with Grant in saying that the theological crisis had two roots, Judaizing and Docetic. "Ignatius, Epistles of," IDB, vol. 3, p. 679, col. 2, par. 2. Virginia Corwin is not too different in her apporach when she recognized a Jewish and Docetic heresy, and a center group, faithful to the teachings of Ignatius. St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960, pp. 52-87. Einar Molland recognized one Docetic heresy which used the Old Testament and was therefore handled by Ignatius as Judaism. "The Heretics Combatted by Ignatius of Antioch," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 5, 1954, p. 6. Recently, Shepherd has advanced a thesis that the heresy combatted by Ignatius was "both a

For our purpose, these letters show an affinity with the Fourth Gospel in its emphasis on the present reality of the kingdom of God rather than the concept of the kingdom as an apocalyptic inheritance of the Church in the historical Jewish sense of our theme.[13] This is not to say, however, that Ignatius did not share an apocalyptic perspective in respect to eternal life. Indeed, there is in *Ephesians* the expressed belief that "these are last days (11:1)." Yet, in this passage and in others which show a use of traditional Jewish elements that sometimes reflected the concept of apocalyptic eschatology and especially that of the promised land, the emphasis is decidedly on the nature and significance of salvation in the present.[14]

---

judaizing one and a gnosticizing one." "The Jews in the Gospel of John: Another Level of Meaning" in *Anglican Theological Review*, Supplementary Series, 3, 1974, p. 110. This would help understand the word "Jew" not only in the Fourth Gospel but also in Revelation. W. H. C. Frend took the same position as Shepherd in this respect. "The Persecutions: Some Links between Judaism and the Early Church," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 9, 1958, p. 149. Von Campenhausen seems to lean this way as well. *The Christian Bible*, pp. 71-72.

[13] David Edward Aune, *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 38, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972, p. 165 (hereafter cited as *Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology*).

[14] It ought to be noted that Aune goes too far when he says "there is no evidence in the letters of Ignatius that eschatological salvation is regarded as a future reality..." *Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology*, p. 164. Other references are to Aune's book unless otherwise noted. Aune paraphrases *Ephesians* 11:1 as "only be found in Jesus Christ, the goal of which is eternal life." (Ibid., p. 159, n. 1) He does this by taking ἐις as a goal or end of an action. Now there is no problem with this use of ἐις -- not even if it be understood as a pregnant construction. But the context as a whole precludes Aune's interpretation. Further, the goal of an action may be expressed with a preposition and a dative or with ἐις and the accusative. Whatever the form of the 1 aorist infinitive, this would hold true. See Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. Gordon M. Messing,Cambridge: Harvard Universtiy Press, 1966, sections 1659-1660, 1686, and 3044. The passage is as follows: "μόνον ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ευρεθῆναι εις τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν." The translation of Grant represents the Greek very well. James A. Kleist is much too free in his rendition of this passage.

Jean Daniélou has drawn attention to some Jewish Christian elements in the letters of Ignatius.[15] These are the Name of God (Ephesians 1:3), the title of "Beloved" for Jesus (Smyrnaeans, salutation), and "plantation" as a name for the Church (Philadelphians 3:1; cf. Trallians 11:1). This last element could have significance for our study. For although it occurs in the Odes of Solomon (38:18-21) in a context which has no eschatological or apocalyptic dimension, it occurs in the Ascension of Isaiah (Testament of Hezekiah IV.3) in a context in which there is a definite association with the land and the messianic kingdom. Yet, neither in Philadelphians nor in Trallians is there an emphasis on any apocalyptic expectation of blessing in the land, but rather on the unity of the Church with God and Christ, especially through the bishop (Philadelphians 3:2).

Throughout the Ignation letters, the concept of salvation is advanced in terms of "the grace which is present" (Ephesians 11:1), the Christian "hope" (Ephesians 21:2; Magnesians 7:1, 11; Trallians 2:2; Philadelphians 5:2; 11:2; Smyrnaeans 10:2), "eternal life" (Ephesians 19:1-3; Polycarp 2:3), "attaining God" (Magnesians 1:2; Philadelphians 9:1-2). It is true that in two passages we find the expression "the kingdom of God" (Ephesians 16:1-2; Philadelphians 3:3). Further, in both of these passages there is an apocalyptic force behind the term kingdom because it is described as a goal that schismatics will not inherit. Rather, a schismatic "will go to unquenchable fire" (Ephesians 16:2). Yet, that the kingdom has already begun and can be experienced by Christians can be inferred from some other passages.

Christ has already been manifested "at the end" (Magnesian 6:1). Indeed, because of the redemptive work of Christ, the old kingdom of wickedness was destroyed and what had been prepared by God (the new kingdom) had its beginning (Ephesians 19:1-3). For this reason the unity of the Church in its frequent assemblings destroys the powers of Satan, because there is nothing better than peace for the abolition of earthly and heavenly warfare (Ephesians 13:1-2). Ignatius, therefore, did not simply look to the apocalyptic wrath to come (1 Thessalonians 1:10; Ephesians 11:1) as a means of destroying the Prince of This Age. He also believed Satan could begin to be destroyed through gentleness in the present age (Trallians 4:2). Two other passages in the Ignatian letters deserve attention. The first is in Romans 6:1 where there is, perhaps, a reference to the offer of the kingdoms of the world which Satan made to Jesus (cf. Matthew 4:8; Luke 4:5). Here, there would have been an excellent opportunity to contrast either the bliss and purity of the messianic kingdom or the transcendance of the New Age with the present kingdom of this age. Yet, the goal, the reward advanced, is simply Jesus himself.

---

[15] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity pp. 40 ff.

The other passage of significance is in Philadelphians 9:1-2. Here, there is an explicit reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Jesus is presented as "the door to the Father," through which door both Old and New Covenant saints enter fellowship with God. It is significant that in spite of a direct reference to an enumeration of Old Covenant saints which begins with Abraham, there is no reference to the theme of the promise. This is, no doubt, because in the thought of Ignatius as reflected in these letters, not the future aspect of the kingdom is stressed, but rather the present reality and power which the Church can possess through the proper unity with God through the Church hierarchy.[16]

---

[16] In light of the heresy Ignatius combatted, the words of Severino Pancaro are in order. "His Kingdom is not of this world; he is King of those who are 'of the truth', of those who believe on him. The Jews in the Passion narrative are those who are not 'of the truth', they are presented as the enemies of Jesus 'as a nation'. Consequently, those who are 'of the truth', the subjects of Jesus, 'are not Jews'. It is of these that Jesus is King. Jesus is not the King of the Jews, he is the King of Israel!" "The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of John," New Testament Studies, 21, 1975, p. 400.

CHAPTER 3

ASIA MINOR

Five documents are assigned to Asia Minor with some probability. These are the letter of Polycarp, the Epistle of the Apostles, and the Acts of John, Peter and Paul. Of special interest is the fact that one of these documents, the Acts of Paul, explicitly replaces Jesus for the promise of the land.

THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP

In 1936, P. N. Harrison advanced the thesis that the Epistle of Polycarp as it now exists contains, in fact, two letters from the hand of Polycarp: 1) an early letter containing chapters thirteen and possibly fourteen which was written shortly after Ignatius' departure from Philippi; and 2) a later letter containing chapters one through twelve which was written to controvert the heresy of Marcion c. A.D. 135.[1] This hypothesis has gained wide but by no means undisputed acceptance among scholars. Certainly the appraisal of L. W. Barnard is too enthusiastic: "The thesis that Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians is, in fact, two letters written on dfferent occasions may be regarded as established beyond doubt..."[2] The Harrison thesis is accepted in Joseph A. Fisher's edition of Die apostolischen Väter,[3] but rejected by William R. Schoedel in R. M. Grant's edition of The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary.[4] The letter concerns itself both with the condition of Ignatius on his way to Rome and with pastoral advice about righteousness, specific church problems at Philippi, and correct doctrine. There is in the letter a remarkable absence of any clear reflection of the Book of

---

[1] P. N. Harrison, Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians, Cambridge: At the University Press, 1936, pp. 80-120.

[2] L. W. Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background, Oxford, Basil Balckwell, 1966, p. 39. Barnard pointed out that Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History omitted the last sentence of chapter 13. Barnard believed that this strengthens Harrison's thesis (Ibid. p. 32).

[3] Joseph A. Fisher, ed., Die apostolischen Väter, Munich: Koset-Verlag, 1956, pp. 234-236; cf. F. L. Cross, Early Christian Fathers, pp. 20-21.

[4] William R. Schoedel, Apostolic Fathers, vol. 5, ed. Robert Grant, pp. 37-41.

Revelation or the apocalypticism involving the millenium. There is, however, one element concerning the eschatological kingdom which merits attention.

In 5:2, the apocalyptic element of the victorious reign is present. But the exact significance of this element is very problematic. This, in part, is due to the fact that in the earlier apocalyptic literature, for the most part, the resurrection of the saints to share in the messianic kingdom served to introduce the New Age, and was sometimes presented as the first part of the New Age. Later, as this present age was perceived with even greater pessimism, the resurrection, sometimes following a messianic age, introduced the saints directly into the transhistorical kingdom of the New Age. Both traditions run through the apocalyptic literature.[5] The passage in question is as follows (5:2):

> ...and should we please him in the present world, we shall gain also the world to come, just as he promised us to raise us from the dead, and that if we 'live worthily as his citizens,' we shall also reign with him, if only we believe.

Both Theodorus Zahn and William Schoedel, among others, have pointed out the similarity of this passage to the "faithful saying" found also in 2 Timothy 2:12.[6] Perhaps this "faithful saying" was also known to Polycarp. This may be true, but it does not take us very far. There are, however, other passages which may be behind Polycarp's use of καὶ συμβασιλεξσομεν αὐτῷ.

---

[5] D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 B.C. - A.D. 100*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964, 285-292 (hereafter cited as *Method and Message of Apocalyptic*).

[6] Theodorus Zahn, *Ignattii et Polycarpi: Epistulae Martyria Fragmenta, in Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, 3 vols., ed. Oscar de Gebhart, Adolf Harnack and Theodorus Zahn, Lipsiae: J. C. Hinricks, 1876, vol. 2, p. 118. Zahn must have meant to refer to 2 Timothy 2:12. Instead the reference reads 1 Timothy 2:12. Zahn adds Romans 8:17 as another parallel; Schoedel, *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, p. 20, n. 26. It is also important at this time to point out the importance of the study of Dennis Duling. He brought to light certain motifs of enthronement, raising up, and reigning which clearly reflected the Davidic promises. Duling also referred to 2 Timothy 2:8 as embodying an earlier tradition in a later Christian writing. "The Promises to David and Their Entrance into Christianity--Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis," pp. 73-77. The connection of the later Pastorals and Polycarp would be easily accepted by von Campenhausen. *The Christian Bible*, pp. 179-181.

The passage in Matthew 19:28 clearly presents the idea of sharing in Christ's rule in the kingdom: "Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Indeed, it is probable that behind this saying is the tradition of the earthly messianic kingdom as the beginning of the New Age, such as is found in Daniel, 1 Enoch 6-36, 1 Enoch 83-90, the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs, the Sibylline Oracles, the Psalms of Solomon, etc.[7] This would be in contrast to the tradition which treats the New Age as completely transhistorical such as in 2 Baruch 30, 1 Enoch 91-104, 2 Enoch, and 2 Esdras. There is, however, no certainty that the passage in Matthew 19:28 or the tradition of the earthly reign is behind the statement "and reign with him."

Two passages in the Book of the Revelation may have some bearing on Epistle of Polycarp 5:2. The first passage is Revelation 20:4-6. It is explicitly stated that those who reign with Christ are those victorious saints over whom the second death has no power. These saints, then, not only are insured immunity from the second death, the lake of fire, but also are promised or guaranteed that they will reign with Christ. The second passage is less clear. Though there are promises given to the Church at Thyatira and the Church at Laodicea which clearly adumbrate the millenial reign itself, the promise to the church at Smyrna only indirectly indicates this. The passage reads as follows:

> Be faithful unto death, and I will give you the crown of life. He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches. He who conquers shall not be hurt by the second death (Revelation 2:10c-11).

Inasmuch as the idea of the second death is associated in a descriptive manner with the victorious saints who reign with Christ in the temporary kingdom, and if in fact this had a particular significance to the church at Smyrna, it may be possible that it is this eschatological tradition which is reflected in Polycarp's passage. If this were true, then the land promise theme with its territorial aspect would be present. This, however, cannot be concluded on the weight of the evidence. Further, just as in the liturgical prayer in the Martyrdom of Polycarp, there is no eschatological element concerning the kingdom of Christ which conveys even the mood or impression of an apocalyptic and earthly messianic kingdom, so there is no eschatological element in the rest of the epistle that points to this tradition.[8] In conclusion, therefore, this apocalyptic element in the context of exhortation to righteous living is, without further qualification, too ambiguous in its reference to determine any exact eschatological tradition.

---

[7] D. S. Russell, Method and Message of Apocalyptic, pp. 286-303.

CONCERNING THE WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA AND THE LIBRARY OF NAG HAMMIDI

A word is in order concerning a large portion of the writings which we will either examine or refer to below. Many of these sources fall outside a formal classification of what is designated as early Christian literature. Recently, Robert McLachlan Wilson pointed out the difficulty the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi presents in its classification both in respect to Christian literature and the New Testament Apocrypha.

Although this is not the place to attempt a solution of this problem, it is appropriate to point out that an exact classification of a large portion of Christian or "Christianized" writings is as yet undetermined. For a thorough examination, moreover, of the purpose, nature, significance, and form-critical criteria concerning these different types of writings, the reader is referred to the standard books on these subjects. For our purpose, it seems best to include both apocryphal writings and writings which are either Christian-Gnostic or have this flavor in order to round out the examination of the theme of the promised land in the "Christian" writings of the second century. This, moreover, seems to be appropriate in light of the thesis which Walter Bauer so strongly advanced which maintained that the difference between what came to be recognized as orthodoxy and heresy as well as the question of which writing preceded the other in the early spread of Christianity is not always certain.

---

[8] Schoedel, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, pp. 70-71, ns. 8-27.

THE EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLES

The Epistle of the Apostles is preserved in an Ethiopic manuscript (afterward, E) and a Coptic manuscript (afterward C). There is also a Latin fragment. Further, E which is substantially complete often differs in details with C.[9]

The apocryphon is an apocalypse which is thinly veiled in the form of an encyclical sent to the entire Church (1 E; cf. 30 E, C).[10] As Jean Daniélou has pointed out, it has several particular motifs in common with other Jewish Christian literature.[11] The secret revelations that the risen Christ shares with the eleven apostles is a feature in the Apocalypse of Peter. The descent into hell to complete the salvation of the Old Testament saints (27 E, C) is also a feature in the Gospel of Peter. The descent of Christ by means of various forms through the seven heavens (13 E, C) is a motif in the Ascension of Isaiah. It shares therefore, features with Jewish Christian writings which probably originated in Egypt and Syria.

There are reasons, however, which indicate Asia Minor as its place of origin: The Epistle of the Apostles is directed against the Gnosticism of Cerinthus and Simon (1 E; 7EC) and the apostle John is placed first among the eleven.[12]

---

[9] Johannes Quasten, Patrology, 3 vols., Utrecht-Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 5th printing, 1975, vol. 1, pp. 150-151 (hereafter cited as Patrology, vol. 1). The annotated text used is that of Hugo Duensing, Epistula Apostolorum, trans. Richard E. Taylor, in New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, pp. 189-227 (hereafter cited as Epistula Apostolorum).

[10] Morton Scott Enslin, "Apostles, Epistle of the," IDB, vol. 1, p. 173.

[11] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 25-28.

[12] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, p. 27; Berthold Altaner and Alfred Stuiber, Patrologie, 7th rev. ed., Frieburg, Basel, and Wien: Herder, 1966, p. 125; Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 150; F. L. Cross, and E. A. Livingstone, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 2d, rev. ed., reprint with corrections, Oxford: Oxford Universtiy Press, 1977, p. 1353 (hereafter cited as ODCC).

The date of the *Epistle of the Apostles* is certainly within the second century. A date after 180 A.D. is improbable because Christ predicts his own return in one hundred and fifty years (17 E, C).[13] Further, the fact that the New Testament writings are used very freely and the fact that the Gnosticism combatted is that of Simon and Cerinthus point to the middle of the second century.[14]

The purpose of this writing is at least threefold: the Gnosticism of Simon and Cerinthus is denounced strongly (1 E; 7, EC); the bodily resurrection of Christ and believers at the *Parousia* is strongly affirmed (11 EC; 12 EC; 15 E; 21 E; 24 EC); and the faithful are directed to persevere in obedience in order to survive the last judgment and gain eternal life (26 EC).

Several features in this writing are important to consider in respect to the theme of the promised land. There is the question of whether or not the inheritance is the same for the Gentiles as it is for the Jews. Further, there is an allusion to the promise of progeny and blessing to Abraham as reflected in Second Isaiah and Galatians. Moreover, the apocalyptic destination of the patriarchs and saints of the Old Testament is discussed. Finally, there is the *Epistle of the Apostles*' consistent presentation of the nature of the kingdom of heaven.

The first passage for consideration is in E only because six leaves are missing in C after chapter thirty.[15] After Christ predicts the mission of Paul to the Gentiles and their subsequent salvation, the apostles ask: "O master, do we have together with them one hope of the inheritance (32 E)?" Hugo Duensing lists Ephesians 3:6 and Acts 26:6

---

[13] Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, p. 27.

[14] Scholars who favor an earlier date are Hugo Duensing (first half of 2d century), *Epistula Apostolorum*, in *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 1, p. 191 (hereafter cited as *Epistula Apostolorum*); Cross-Livingstone (cf. 155), *ODCC*, p. 1353; and Quasten (140-160), *Patrology*, vol. 1, p. 150. Some scholars who favor a later date are Morton Scott Enslin (2d century), "Apostles, Epistle of the," *IDB*, vol. 1, p. 172; Altaner-Stuiber (der 2. Hälfte des 2 Jh., um 170), *Patrologie*, p. 125.

[15] Duensing, *Epistula Apostolorum*, p. 212.

UMI

as possible sources for this question.[16] Both of these New Testament passages refer to the promise to the patriarchs. Yet, in Acts 26:6, while reference is made to the historic promise of the land to the patriarchs, the context shows that in Paul's speech this is interpreted as the resurrection. Further, although the general context in Ephesians includes explicit reference to the covenants of promise which belonged to the commonwealth of Israel, the hope and promise is reinterpreted to mean a Gentile and Jewish common inheritance of salvation in Christ. We need not, however, stop with these two passages as possible sources behind this passage in the *Epistle of the Apostles*. As we discussed in our examination of First Peter, other passages in the early chapters and early speeches of Peter reflect the historical Jewish concept of promised blessing in the land as an apocalyptic hope of the nation Israel. Indeed, even in reference to Acts 26:6 and Ephesians 3:6, what Walter Brueggemann wrote is pertinent: that although the promise may be redefined, it is difficult to "deny the central and enduring referent which is land, unless we are to succomb to an otherworldly hermeneutic."[17] The question, then, is whether or not the author of the *Epistle of the Apostles* has done this.

The answer we believe, ought to be made in the affirmative: the author of the *Epistle of the Apostles* has denied the central referent which is land. Further, although there is a strong indication that this is so in the immediate context, it will be substantiated below in our discussion of the nature of the kingdom. For here in chapter thirty-two of the *Epistle of the Apostles*, the hope of one inheritance is identified with being "in the kingdom of heaven with my Father." This, in all probability, points toward a heavenly kingdom of the New Age. Further, it is similar in its focus to the concept of inheritance in First Peter in which an earthly aspect of the promised inheritance is not reflected.

---

[16] Ibid, p. 213, n. 14.

[17] Brueggemann, *The Land*, p. 178.

Another passage provides an allusion to the promise of progeny and blessing to Abraham. The passage is as follows (chapter 33):

> He will be (ms. C: strong) in his faith, that the word of the prophet may be fulfilled where it says, 'Behold, out of the land of Syria I will begin to call a new Jerusalem, and I will subdue Zion and it will be captured; and the barren one who has no children will be fruitful and will be called the daughter of my Father, but to me, my bride; for so has it pleased him who sent me.'

This reflects the passage in Second Isaiah which uses the image of barren Sarah to show how God would miraculously cause many heirs to possess not just the historic boundaries of the promised land, but the nations as well (54:1 ff.). Further, Paul referred to this passage in Isaiah when he argued that the Church as the spiritual seed of Abraham is joint-heir with Christ of the promises which included the world (Galatians 4:27; cf. Romans 4:13). There are, however, two reasons why this allusion to the promised progeny does not carry with it any significance in respect to the theme of promised blessing in the land.

On the one hand, the passage in the Epistle of the Apostles stops short of the territorial aspect of blessing found in Isaiah 54:2 ff. Surely, if this aspect of the tradition were important to the author, a quotation including the land would have made this clear. On the other hand, the author does not construct, as did Paul, a careful and involved argument emphasizing the fact that the believer is heir to the promise(s) made to Abraham. On the contrary, the call of "a new Jerusalem" is promised no earthly sphere in which it would realize blessing.

One passage is striking in its discussion of the apocalyptic destiny of the patriarchs and saints of the Old Testament. There is, however, considerable difference in detail in E and C. The passage, therefore, will be given in both versions:

> And on that account I have descended and have spoken with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, to your fathers the prophets, and have brought to them news that they may come from the rest which is below into heaven, and have given them the right hand of the baptism of life and forgiveness and pardon for all wickedness as to you, so from now on also to those who believe in me. (27 E)

> On that account I have descended to (the place of) Lazarus, and have preached (to the righteous and) to the prophets, that they may come forth from the rest which is below and go up to what is (above)... right (hand) to them...of life and forgiveness and deliverance (from) all (evil), as I have done to you and (to those who) believe in me. (27 C)

While there are differences, the destination of the saints of the Old Testament are the same in both -- heaven. E is of greater significance for our theme, however, inasmuch as it shows that the patriarchs to whom was given the promise of blessing in the land were clearly in mind. Further, it is obvious that no further habitation of the terrestrial aspect of that promise is expected. It may be inferred that after the resurrection, a theme important to this Epistle of the Apostles, their blessing will not be in any sort of transformed Canaan but rather heaven.

The final point of consideration in this apocryphon is the way it consistently presents the nature of the kingdom. The kingdom is regularly associated with "the Father" of Christ or designated the "kingdom of my Father" (12 EC; 19 EC; 21 EC; 26 EC; 28 EC). Further, the kingdom is always in heaven. Moreover, the non-earthly nature of the kingdom is stressed. This is particularly important in light of the strong emphasis of the materiality and reality of the bodily resurrection (11 EC; 12 EC; 15 E; 21 E; 24 EC). The passage which shows this emphasis is as follows:

> '... Truly I say to you, such a rest will be yours where there is no eating and drinking and no mourning and singing (or care) and neither earthly garment nor perishing. And you will not have part in the creation of below, but will belong to the incorruptibility of my Father, you who will not perish. As I am continually in the Father, so also you (are) in me.' (19E)
>
> '... Truly I say to you, your rest will be (above?) in the place where there is (neither) eating nor drinking, neither (rejoicing) nor mourning nor perishing of those who are (in it. You) have no part in..., but you will receive of the (incorruptibility of my Father. As I) am in him, so (you will be) in me.' (19C)

It should be noted, that E gives greater emphasis to the heavenly nature of the kingdom by the phrase "and you will not have part in the creation below." Finally, the chosen kingdom as the promised rest of the elect is designated as the place in heaven which the Father has prepared for eternal life (28 EC; cf. John 10:28-29; 14:1-3; 17:2).

In conclusion, therefore, in this writing the promised hope of one inheritance is common to the elect Jews and Gentiles and it is the kingdom of the Father. The concept of promised blessing in the land as to its territorial aspect has no place here. It is altogether foreign to the apocalyptic expectations of the author.

THE ACTS OF JOHN AND THE ACTS OF PETER

The relationship between the Acts of Peter and the Acts of John is problematic. The thesis argued by Carl Schmidt and accepted by Johannes Quasten and Morton Scott Enslin maintained the priority of the Acts of John, which was followed shortly by the Acts of Paul. Subsequently, there followed the Acts of Peter and the other apocryphal acts.[18] This position, however, can no longer be maintained with certainty.

The investigations of Carl Schmidt in a later investigation of the Hamburg Papyrus of the Acts of Paul, as well as those of both Wilhelm Schneemelcher and Knut Schäferdiek, point to new possibilities.[19] Indeed, the conclusion of Schäferdick is that the date of composition of the Acts of John is very uncertain with the greatest probability being the third century.[20] This position, moreover, is accepted by Schneemelcher who asserts the priority of the Acts of Peter (180-190), to be followed by the Acts of Paul (185-195).[21] These are the dates presented in the Patrologie of Altaner-Striber, and accepted in the main in the second, revised edition of the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.[22]

---

[18] Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 135; M. S. Enslin, "John, Acts of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 930-932; idem, "Peter, Acts of," IDB, vol. 3, pp. 757-758; idem, "Paul, Acts of," IDB, vol. 3, pp. 678-680.

[19] Wilhelm Schneemeelcher, The Acts of Peter in New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 266 (hereafter cited as Acts of Peter); William Schneemelcher and Knut Schäferdiek, "Second and Third Century Acts of the Apostles: Introduction," in New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, 184-185.

[20] Knut Schäferdiek, The Acts of John in New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, pp. 214-215 (hereafter cited as Acts of John).

[21] Schneemelcher, Acts of Peter, p. 275.

[22] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, pp. 136-138; Cross-Livingstone, eds., ODCC, pp. 742, 1049, 1068.

This new position is preferred for the following reasons: there is very uncertain attestation of the Acts of John before Eusebius;[23] the literary similarities are better explained by ideas from similar traditions inasmuch as these common ideas are used with different theological intentions and applications (Acts of John 87-88 with Acts of Peter 20-21; Acts of John 98 with Acts of Peter 20, but also Justin, Dialogue 100.4 and Letter to Diognetus 9.6; Acts of John 99 with Acts of Peter 39 [10]; and the probability that the Acts of Paul is dependent on the Acts of Peter because of scenes which do not fit the context very well in the Hamburg Papyrus version of the Acts of Paul.[24]

Two points remain to be made. The first is that the place of composition of these Acts is assigned by most scholars to Asia Minor. There is, both early and good evidence for this in the case of the Acts of Paul (Tertullian, On Baptism, chapter 17). The second point is that while the new position in respect to chronological order and literary dependence is probable, it has not been demonstrated as certain. Indeed, the evidence of the misplaced scene of the "Quo vadis" in the Hamburg Papyrus version has been challenged by Wilhelm Michaelis as to its significance. Michaelis argues on the basis of the same evidence that the Acts of Peter is dependent on the Acts of Paul.[25] The Acts of John, therefore, will be given some attention before examining the concept of the promised land in the Acts of Peter.

In the Acts of John, two sections merit attention. The first section contains a passage in which the concept of inheritance is joined with that of the kingdom of God. The passage occurs in a scene involving John's last act of worship before his departure. The passage in part, is as follows:

---

[23] Schäferdiek, Acts of John, p. 190.

[24] Schneemelcher, Acts of Peter, pp. 264-266.

[25] Wilhelm Michaelis, ed. and trans., Die Apokryphen Schriften zum Neuen Testament, Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag, 1956, pp. 376-379. On the whole, the present writer prefers Schneemelcher's judgment. Acts of Peter, p. 266, n. 1; idem, Acts of Paul, p. 345.

> My brethren and fellow servants, joint-heirs and partners with me in the kingdom of God, you know the Lord, how great works he has granted you through me, how many wonders, how many healings, how many signs...

This passage could point to the hope of enjoying the kingdom of God as heirs of the promised blessing in the land. Indeed, the probability that this work originated in Asia Minor and the fact that the hero of this book is the apostle John could indicate that this is the significance of the phrase "heirs ...of the kingdom of God."

This understanding of the kingdom was a view that was well attested in Asia Minor in the second century (Revelation, Papias, Barnabas, if it belongs here, Cerinthus, Montanism). It is possible that the author believed John was the author of the Revelation. The view that the apostle John wrote the Revelation was widely held in the Church from the middle of the second century, and is attested by the following writers: Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus and Origen.[26] The author, then, may have had in mind the apocalyptic schemata of the Revelation inasmuch as the terminology of the inheritance of the future kingdom is not emphasized in the Gospel or Letters of John. If this were the case, then this passage would be the second passage in the book which could reflect contact with Revelation.

This concept of the kingdom of God in terms of an inaugural messianic age was not the only perspective current in Asia Minor at this time. The letter of Polycarp, the Pastorals, if they belong here, and the Johannine literature are evidence of this. Nor was the authorship of this Revelation universally assigned to the apostle John. Indeed, the author of Revelation does not identify himself as the apostle, and the

---

[26] Justin (Dialogue with Trypho, 81); Irenaeus (Against Heresies iv. 20.11 in the Harvey edition); Tertullian (Against Marcion, iii.14 in Evans edition); Clement of Alexandria (Stromata vi.13 in The Ante Nicene Fathers, vol. 2); Hippolytus (Antichrist, ch. 36 in The Ante Nicene Fathers, vol. 5); Origen (in his first book of his Commentary on John according to Eusebius, Church History vi. 25.7-10 in the edition of Arthur Cushman McGiffert).

Roman presbyter Gaius may have attributed the authorship to Cerinthus (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, iii.28), although this, according to Arthur Cushman McGiffert cannot be maintained.[27] It is not self-evident that the passage in the Acts of John signifies a future inheritance of the kingdom of God. Nor is it evident that the author had knowledge of or made use of the Revelation of John.

Both the immediate context and the Acts of John as a whole indicate a concept of the kingdom of God which signifies salvation as a present reality which will, after death, be apocalyptically realized not in an inaugural messianic age but in Christ for eternity (chapters 107-115). The focus is not on the possession of a coming kingdom, but rather on the present possession of a kingdom already come. And that is close to the emphasis of the Fourth Gospel which may be said to stress what the Church has inherited rather than what it will inherit. This is not to imply, however, that either the Acts of John or the Fourth Gospel ignore or deny a future kingdom.

There is present in both of these works a certain tension between the possession of the kingdom which has come and the expectation of life with Christ in the coming kingdom of God.[28] The author of the Fourth Gospel looks forward to the second advent of Christ so that where Christ is, there the elect may be also (John 14:1-3; 21:22). So too, the author of the Acts of John expects to be with Christ in the state of rest "which is inexpressible and unutterable salvation" (Chapter 113). Moreover, in this section of the Acts of John, apocalyptic imagery is used to indicate a certain destruction of the Satanic world as John passes from earth to the heavenly "rest" (chapter 114). This is similar to those passages in the letters of Ignatius which state that the power of the Satanic kingdom has been broken and will continue to be destroyed through the presence of the kingdom of Christ.[29]

---

[27] Trans. and annotated by Arthur Cushman McGiffert. The Church History of Eusebius in (Volume 1) Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d ser. ed. Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, Oxford and New York: Parker and Co., and Christian Literature Co., 1890, p. 160, n. 4 (hereafter cited as Church History).

[28] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Gospel According to John," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, pp. 713 (on 3:3-13), 723 (on ch. 14). For the concept that the Fourth Gospel was universal in its appeal -- and therefore possessing a certain tension -- in order to win Samaritans to Christianity see the following: J. W. Bailey, "The Temporary Messianic Reign in the Literature of Early Judaism," Journal of Biblical Literature, 53, 1934, pp. 179-180; Marinus de Jonge, "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' According to the Fourth Gospel," New Testament Studies, 19, 1973, pp. 247, 263; Charles H. H. Scobie, "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity," New Testament Studies, 19, 1973, pp. 400, 403, 407. Again, Aune seems too one-sided in his stress on realized eschatology alone. Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology, pp. 134-135.

The other passage for our consideration in the Acts of John is found in the section entitled "The Hymn of Christ" (94:23-24). The passage is as follows:

> 'I have no temple
>   and I have temples.' -- 'Amen'
> 'I am a lamp to you [singular]
>   who see me.' -- 'Amen.'

This passage seems to reflect Revelation 21:22-23, in which the New Jerusalem of the New Age is presented as having no temple, for its temple is the Lord and in which its lamp is the Lamb. This could point to an acceptance of the apocalyptic schemata of the Revelation. This would be pure speculation, however. If it has an apocalyptic force to it -- and it seems quite possible to the present writer that it does -- then it is more probable that the nature of that apocalypticism would refer to the New Age of Eternity (which is the context of the reference in the Revelation).

When we turn our attention to the Acts of Peter, we, at first, see little difference in the concept of the apocalyptic hope of the Church. There are several passages which with a good deal of clarity indicate that the nature of the kingdom is presented in terms of the Two Ages -- this world is contrasted with the World to Come. There is further evidence which suggests that the concept of the kingdom is already present because of the presence of the Church. Yet, there are two very clear references to Daniel. One of these in its original context explicitly presented the concept of the kingdom in terms of the land promise in association with the Davidic tradition. It will be necessary to determine the significance of these references in the context of this writing.

---

[29] Ephesians 13:1-2; 19:1-3; Trallians 4:2.

Two passages suggest rather clearly that the author's apocalyptic schemata did not include the concept of the promised land, but rather that of this world and the transhistorical Age to Come. The first passage involves a story in which a woman Eubula is robbed of her possessions (6:17) while Simon is staying in her home. Eubula is distraught over the incident, and Peter, concerned about both her misfortune and her salvation, promises that the Lord will allow her to recover her loss. He exhorts her to repent, be saved "renounce this present world and seek for everlasting refreshment." Subsequently, the suspects confess under torture; and the loss with an additional sum is restored. Eubula then confesses Christ and gives her goods to the poor: "and despising and renouncing this world she gave alms to the widows and orphans and clothes to the poor; and after a long time she gained her repose."

In the second passage Peter proclaims that salvation can be attained if one repents and turns to God (8:28). The inheritance of the devil (damnation) is contrasted with the inheritance of Christ (salvation). "For if even this man can repent, that is better; for God will not remember evil (deeds). So let him come into the light of Christ. But if he cannot, let him possess the inheritance of his father the devil..." The "light of Christ" by implication is the inheritance which is contrasted with that of the devil, and it is something into which the believer can now enter.

Two other passages continue this concept of the contrast between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of darkness and reflect the fact that the kingdom of God is a present reality which can be experienced now. The first passage involves a speech of Peter in which he warns the people of Rome about the deceptive powers of Satan, and presents the kingdom of God as the hope of the believer -- a kingdom which is present in the established Church (3:7). In the second passage, Peter contrasts Satan's "gates of darkness" with the "doors of Christ Jesus," against which doors Satan knocks and seeks to enter, in order to carry off the sheep of the Lord (4:8). Peter affirms however that Satan's attack is in vain, for Christ keeps his doors most carefully. While there is no evidence that this passage depends on Matthew 16:18, the imagery is similar: "And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it."

This concept of the kingdom of God -- the New Age mysteriously present through the Church -- is similar to that of another writing, the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles. This writing, which is part of the library of Nag Hammadi, is apparently orthodox in doctrine and probably is to be dated in the second century.[30] Moreover, it expresses a concern for the poor not unlike that of the canonical James (11-12; cf. James 2:5-7).

In the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, Peter encounters a disguised Christ who is described as the god of the pearl (5:15), an appellation applied to Christ in the Acts of Peter (7:20). Christ invites men to receive the gift of a pearl free (4:1-35; cf. Revelation 2:17; 21:21). Those who wish to receive freely this pearl must renounce the world, endure many hardships and enter into the city of Habitation, surrounded by high walls and having nine gates. Further, those who inhabit the city do so because they continue to endure in the midst of apostasies and difficulties (5-7).

This city, which is not unlike the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21-22, may be a picture of the Church as the kingdom of God, mysteriously present in this world. Those who persevere in the faith will be able to experience this kingdom in eternity (cf. Matthew 13:37, 41). In short, as in the Acts of Peter 4:8, the kingdom of God in the sense of the Age to Come has broken into this world and is present as the Church of Christ. If one remains faithful, he is assured a place in this kingdom in eternity. The passage in the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles reads as follows (6:35-7:20):

---

[30] Douglas M. Parott and Robert McLahlan Wilson, Nag Hammadi Library, p. 265.

> ...I asked him if the name of the city was really Habitation. He (...)[31] '(Habitation...)' He said to me, '(You speak) truly, for we (inhabit) here because we endure.'
> (I responded), saying, 'Justly (...) I have men named it (...), because (by) everyone (who) endures his trial, cities are inhabited; and a precious kingdom comes from them, because they endure in the midst of the apostasies and the difficulties of the storms. So that in this way, the city of everyone who endures the burden of his yoke of faith will be inhabited, and he will be included in the kingdom of heaven (cf. Matthew 13:37, 41).'

Further, the city, at times, and especially inthis passage, almost becomes a symbol of a man's body or life which will be inhabited (by Christ). But this is not the force of "the city" in the total context of the book.[32]

Finally, there remains in the Acts of Peter -- not the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles -- the passage in which two references are made to the book of Daniel (8:24). This occurs in the contest between Peter and Simon. Simon derides the virgin birth, the diety and crucifixion of Christ. Peter responds by denouncing Simon's words and affirming the fact that the Son of God, born of a virgin, has truly come into the world. In this context, Christ is described as "a stone cut out without hands" who "has broken all the kingdoms (Daniel 2:34);" and "the stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner (cf. Mark 12:10)." In the present context of the Acts of Peter this clearly refers to the fact that Christ has come and his kingdom has already broken all the kingdoms, a concept which parallels that of Ignatius in Ephesians 19:1-3.

In the Acts of Peter, the second reference to Daniel is charged with the apocalyptic imagery of the coming kingdom (8:24):

---

[31] "Parentheses indicate material supplied by the editor or translator ... it provides useful information for the reader." Nag Hammadi Library, p. xvi.

[32] This ends our discussion of The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles.

> And again the prophet says of him, 'And behold I saw one coming upon a cloud like a son of man.'

This image originally referred to the kingdom of Israel whose form of a man stands in marked contrast to that of the kingdoms of the world which are in the forms of beasts. This image, however, was used in 1 Enoch (45-57) to signify a messianic individual.[33] Further, in the Synoptics, the Son of Man was used at times to designate One who would come in messianic power and glory to inaugurate the kingdom of God (Mark 8:38; 13:32, 36; 14:62; Matthew 16:27, 24:30; 26:64; Luke 9:26; 21:27; 22:69). This image is clearly behind such passages as 1 Thessalonians 1:7-11 and Revelation 1:7 and 19:11-16. Indeed, it is difficult to see how this reference could not refer to the Parousia in which Christ will inaugurate the kingdom of God -- whether messianic or eternal. According to Acts, Christ was received up to heaven in the clouds. Would he not return in like manner (Acts 1:11)?

It may be that the author meant this passage to signify the second advent and the beginning of the apocalyptic kingdom. Then the question would remain whether or not a temporal messianic kingdom was meant. This, of course, would be the only place in the writing in which such a concept was clearly advanced; but then this is the case in Revelation 20:1-7. Like Revelation, the apocalyptic schemata could provide both a messianic kingdom in which the concept of the promised land would be realized territorially and an eternal kingdom. The context, however, abruptly stops short of any clear explanation (8:24)

> And again the prophet says of him, And behold I saw one coming upon a cloud like a son of man. And what more (need be said)? You men of Rome, if you were versed in the prophetic writings I would explain all (this) to you; for through them it had to be (told) in secret and the kingdom of God be fulfilled. But these things shall be disclosed to you hereafter.[34]

---

[33] J. T. Milik believed the "Similitudes" or "Parables of Enoch" were of late and Christian origin. Books of Enoch, pp. 91 ff. J. A. Fitzmeyer accepted, however, the "Parables of Enoch" as early and non-Christian. "New Enoch Literature," pp. 342-343.

[34] R. B. Y. Scott has pointed out the apocalyptic imagery of "Coming in Clouds" but the author chooses to ignore this motif. "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds," New Testament Studies, 5, 1958-1959, pp. 127-132.

There are, in fact, two other passages which indicate that neither the concept of the promised land nor the messianic kingdom were in the apocalyptic hopes of the author of the Acts of Peter. In 2:5, Peter is instructed by the Lord to remain in Jerusalem. No further comment is made concerning Jerusalem as the city of David, the promised land, or anything which would indicate the author attached to it even a symbolic-apocalyptic significance. Again, in 7:20 the author praises Christ for what he has effected for the salvation of men and describes him among other things as greater than all princedom. Yet he does not refer to a future time in which Christ will reign over the earth as the King of kings.

The evidence, therefore, of the presence of a temporary messianic kingdom is insufficient to make a certain conclusion. Every other indication, however, is that this is not the author's meaning and the concept of the promised land is with an extremely high degree of probability not present in the Acts of Peter.

THE ACTS OF PAUL

All that need be said by way of introduction to the Acts of Paul has been pointed out above in the introduction to the Acts of John and the Acts of Peter.

The Acts of Paul is unequivocal in its rejection of the concept of the promise of blessing in the land as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. One passage makes this clear; and throughout the writing there is no evidence to the contrary.

The passage occurs in the context of a speech which Paul makes to the "brethren and soldiers of Christ" who have assembled in Claudius' house after the arrival of Paul in Rome (chapter 10, Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 381). The purpose of the speech is to encourage the believers to endure in their faith in order to receive the promise of salvation in Christ. He does this by using the history of Israel as an example.

The speech throughout reflects the perspective of the Mosaic covenant of conditional blessing. On the basis of obedience, God blessed Israel, and on the basis of disobedience God chastened Israel. The deliverance from Egypt and the period of the wandering in the wilderness demonstrated God's gracious election. Moreover, in spite of the fact that the theological perspective here is predominately that of the Mosaic tradition, the Abrahamic covenant involving the promise of progeny and land is definitely referred to in the following sentence: "And so long as they kept the things of God, he gave them of the fruit of the loins, after he had promised them the land of the Canaanites, and he made the foreign people subject to them"(chapter 10). This last phrase reflects the Davidic tradition.

The tone of the speech shifts at this point to one of an apologetic nature. This, no doubt, is due to the fact that complete forfeiture of the promise to Abraham requires solid justification. For an important aspect of the promise of the inheritance of the land is mentioned. It is the addition which P made in order to heighten the unconditionality of the promise: the promise is eternal. An explanation, therefore, is in order. Here, the heinousness of Israel's disobedience is dramatically presented against God's love and grace. Once again the speech reiterates that God nourished Israel in the wilderness.

A new demonstration of God's love and grace is then introduced. God sent the prophets to proclaim the Lord Jesus Christ to Israel. Further, the prophets did this with the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. First Peter 1:10-12). These who of old proclaimed Christ through "the spirit of Christ" however, suffered a great deal, and were slain by the people of Israel. The Israelites, therefore, forsook "the living God according to their own desires," and because of this "they forfeited the eternal inheritance," the land of Canaan (chapter 10).

This severe example having been put forward, Paul proceeds to tell the brethren that they must endure in spite of a great temptation which lies before them. And if they endure, they will receive, not the land, but "the refuge and shield of his good pleasure Jesus Christ"(chapter 10). Moreover, this Jesus was sent by God, according to the prophetic word and he is "our King" who taught "The kingdom of heaven is at hand! Forsake the darkness, receive the light, you who live in the darkness of death! "(cf. Matthew 4:16; Isaiah 9:2).

The concept of the promised land as an apocalyptic hope is clearly acknowledged. In fact, the Abrahamic, the Davidic, and the

Mosaic traditions concerning this hope are all reflected to a greater or lesser degree, with that of the Mosaic predominating. Even the heightening of the promissory nature of P is reproduced, although, of course, this would not have been in the awareness of the author. Yet, the promise is treated as an historical one which because of Israel's disobedience is no longer in effect. There is, further, no attempt to apply this promise to the Church or to insist, as Paul did in both Galatians and Romans, that the promise somehow still endures. Rather, the implication is that the hope of the Church is the person of Christ. There is no territorial referrent in this assertion.

This theological perspective is close to that presented in the "Preaching of Peter." Yet, in the "Preaching of Peter," which will be discussed below, this rejection is not in terms which so precisely reflect the theme of the promised land. The specific rejection of this promise in the Acts of Paul is somewhat curious. Indeed, the precision with which the Acts of Paul delineates both the promise of the land as an eternal inheritance of Israel and the subsequent annullment of that promise is unique in all the writings in this period.

It will be recalled, that while it is probable that both the Acts of Peter and the Acts of John originated in Asia Minor, the evidence is strongest and most explicit for the Acts of Paul. Probably, the author's purposes involved primarily moral issues such as sexual purity and godly living within the faith in order to attain the resurrection. Other factors, such as a woman's role in the Church or a correct apocalyptic hope can still be important without being the dominant theme.

It is possible, that the hope of the promised land was a live issue in the author's theological arena. The problem this then created, moreover, may not have been the result of orthodox writers who cherished this apocalyptic hope; but rather the result of heretical teachers who held the Gnostic and chiliastic views of Cerinthus. Almost exactly contemporaneous with the writing of the Acts of Paul, the Roman presbyter Gaius found it necessary to condemn the teaching of Cerinthus for abusing the concept of the millenium by interjecting the hope of renewed sexual activity during the thousand years. If we take into account the fact that for the author of the Acts of Paul "the motif of sexual continence plays a dominant role" in almost every episode (e.g. chapter 5),[35] then the kind of apocalyptic expectations of a Cerinthian Gnosticism presented a very real problem. Further, if the teaching of Cerinthus is faithfully preserved in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, then we have the concept of the blessing in the land as a means whereby sexual unions and not sexual continence would be enjoyed.[36] While this proposal cannot be demonstrated as true, both the unique precision of describing and rejecting the concept of the land and the emphasis on sexual purity as necessary for the hope of resurrection are easily understandable in light of the carnal emphasis of Cerinthus' sort of heretical teaching. Indeed, as in Second Peter 3:10, the author sees this world as corrupted by sin and in need of an apocalyptic fire which will burn it up until it is pure (11:3).

---

[35] Wilhelm Schneemelcher, Acts of Paul, p. 350.

[36] For this sort of pagan life style that would be unacceptable to the Christians see Otto Kieffer, Sexual Life in Ancient Rome, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1956; Michael Grant, Eros in Pompeii: The Secret Rooms of the National Museum of Naples, with a description of the collection by Antonio De Simone and Maria Teresa Merella, New York: William Morrow and Company, 1975; John Boardman and Eugenio La Rocca, Eros in Greece, New York: EABS, 1975.

UMI

CHAPTER 4

EGYPT

THE PREACHING OF PETER

This work is assigned by most scholars to the first half of the second century. It is attested by both Clement and Origen, who show that Heracleon made use of it (Commentary on John, xiii.17). Its place of origin is considered to be Egypt.[1] The few fragments we have from it recommend caution in our evaluation of its content.

The passage which relates to our theme is designated the fifth fragment according to Ernst von Dobschutz. The passage seems to advocate a position similar to that of the Acts of Paul in reference to the theme of the promised land. This, however, it does in quite a different way. For while it rejects the Jewish form of worshiping God, it does so en masse without hinting at the slightest awareness that there was the promise of the land. The passage, which is preserved in the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria (vi. 5. 39-41), is as follows:

> Learn then, ye also, holily and righteously what we deliver to you and keep it, worshping God through Christ in a new way. For we have found in the Scriptures, how the Lord says: 'Behold, I make with you a new covenant, not as I made (one) with your fathers in Mount Horeb.' A new one has he made with us. For what has reference to the Greeks and Jews is old. But we are Christians, who as a third race worship him in a new way.[2]

It ought to be noted, that while there is a reference to the Mosaic Covenant, there is nothing to indicate this has any significance other than that of the Law. Further, it would seem appropriate to conclude that anything which had to do with Israel in the sense of the Jewish realities -- Law, Temple, Kingdom -- would likely be considered part of the "old," and therefore irrelevent for the new, third race of Christians. Hence, the rejection of the concept of the promised land is implicit.

---

[1] Wilhelm Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 94-95; Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 133; Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 1070; Morton Scott Enslin, "Peter, Preaching of," IDB, vol. 3, 767.

[2] Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 100.

CHAPTER 5

CONCERNING THE LIBRARY OF NAG HAMMADI

Christian Gnosticism was an eclectic and syncretistic movement which comprised many different groups and teachings.[1] Although in various incipient forms, it may have posed a serious challenge to orthodox beliefs in the first century (1 Corinthians 8:1-8?; Colossians 2:8-23; Galatians 5:1-18, 6:12-15), it was especially strong in the second century. It probably had its roots in both Hellenistic and Jewish systems, but the quest for its origins is very problematic.[2] Further, it seems unlikely to the present writer, that the diverse kinds of religious and philosophical phenomena which fall under the designation of Christian Gnosticism could all stem from the same sources.[3] Indeed, it is not always clear whether or not a particular individual, writing, or system is in fact Gnostic in its Christian form. An example of this would be Marcion and his Antitheses[4] or the Gospel of Thomas.[5]

---

[1] Robert McLaklan Wilson, The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy, London: A. R. Mowlray and Company, Limited, 1964 reprint of 1958, pp. 256-257; Robert M. Grant, After the New Testament, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967, pp. 195-207.

[2] G.van Groningen, First Century Gnosticism: Its Origin and Motifs, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967, pp. 9-28.

[3] Such as the theory of Robert M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959, p. 38. Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 29, n. 26.

[4] Robert McLaklan Wilson questions the Gnosticism of Marcion. Gnosis and the New Testament, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968, pp. 14, 22; cf. Elaine H. Pagels, "Gnosticism," IDBS, p. 366, sec. 4, a. Robert Grant clearly places Marcion within Gnosticism. Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 137. In a later work, however, Grant took a more modified position on Marcion. Early Christian Literature, pp. 109-111.

[5] Jacques-E. Menard, "Thomas, Gospel of," IDBS, pp. 902-904; Helmut Koester, introduction to The Gospel of Thomas, in Nag Hammadi Library, p. 117; Henri-Charles Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, pp. 278-307; W. H. C. Frend, "The Gospel of Thomas: Is Rehabilitation Possible," Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., 18, 1967, pp. 16, 26; Gilles Quispel, "Gnosticism and the New Testament," Vigiline Christianae, 19, 1965, pp. 66-67.

It would seem appropriate for our purposes, therefore, to describe Christian Gnosticism as a movement which was essentially characterized by the conviction that gnosis -- a term which is itself illusive of definition -- enabled an elite group to escape the perversity of the world system and attain to their divine source. That groups which held such a persuasion were often secretive in their organization, and utilized such means as personal writings and instruction, special initiations, prescribed rituals, and alleged authoritative or apostolic traditions both to define themselves and to justify their theological perspective is not unique in religious movements. Indeed, it is not inconceivable to the present writer, that some of the Gnostic claims concerning a basis for their beliefs in the personal teaching of an apostle or disciple of the Lord were true. We certainly have no evidence of the content of instruction of many of the first century apostles and disciples. Further, that such Christian Gnostic groups were the result of or a combination of such phenomena as apocalyptic disappointment, psychological introspection and mythical projection, severe pessimism, spiritual revelations, peculiar exegesis or some other unorthodox response to life is perfectly consistent with the kind of religious phenomena experienced today.

This movement, which was an especially virulent threat to orthodox Christianity in the second century,[6] is significantly reflected in the library of Nag Hammadi. These writings, most of which probably originated in the second century, comprise works which are of very different types. The original significance of a work may have been considerably different from that which it held for the collector(s). Some of these writings, moreover, are from their internal evidence not Gnostic in the sense indicated above. The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, the Teaching of Silvanus, the Sentences of Sextus, and a fragment from Plato's Republic are examples of this.

It is not our purpose to examine Christian Gnosticism per se in this literature. Rather, we intend to indicate that in these compositions, terminology is used which in the essentially Christian literature refers to its historical significance or to its apocalyptic significance rooted in the historical realities. In these Christian Gnostic writings, however, either or both of these meanings are substantially altered so as to be inapplicable to the concept of the promised land in any meaningful way.[7] Further, an examination of these writings serves to put forward the limits of an other worldly hermeneutic in deference to a theological perspective which in some sense was future oriented in that it looked forward to a time of ultimate reunion with the divine source or of some kind of heavenly and other worldly existence. This will be done, for the most part, in a summary manner similar to that in Part 1 of this thesis, inasmuch as the theological perspective of these writings is largely outside of orthodox Christianity.

---

[6] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Gospel According to John," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 708; idem, "The Rise of Christianity" in A Short History of Christianity, ed. Archibald G. Baker, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940, pp. 14-15; cf. George E. Ladd, The New Testament and Criticism, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967,

The presentation of the writings discussed will follow the classification of the works according to the types of Gnosticism they represent, as suggested by George W. MacRae in his article "Nag Hammadi" in the supplementary volume of the Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Sethian types; Valentinian types; other types.

SETHIAN

Of the writings assigned to the second century which show an affinity with Sethian Gnosticism, two works, the Apocalypse of Adam and the Paraphrase of Shem, show no evidence of the concept of the promised land. There is, in fact, no terminology present in these writings which reflects the concept of reigning with Christ or of a future kingdom. In contrast to these two, however, the Second Treatise of the Great Seth promises to the Gnostic believers the enjoyment of what may be, according to Joseph A. Gibbons, "a true brotherhood on earth, and bliss in the joy and union of eternal life."[8] The passage

---

pp. 204-205.

[7] Samuel Laeuchli, The Language of Faith: An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church, New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, p. 28.

[8] Joseph A. Gibbons, introduction to "The Second Treatise of the Great Seth," Nag Hammadi Library, p. 329.

which best reflects this promise certainly does not emphasize an earthly aspect of the future rest (69-70). The supposition that the roots of this future enjoyment could go back to the concept of the promised land is highly improbable inasmuch as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and David are rejected as "a laughinstock"(62-64).

VALENTINIAN

In the writings which show an affinity with the Valentinian type of Gnosticism, there is a greater presence of ideas or terminology which in the orthodox Christian writings often reflected the concept of the promised land in some sense. Although the "Prayer of Paul," "A Valentinian Exposition" on anointing, baptism, and the eucharist, and the Gospel of Truth suggest nothing at all in deference to our theme, the Treatise on the Resurrection, a writing which probably is to be dated in the late second century.[9] affirms the reality of the resurrection of the elect (47).[10] This could indicate a belief in a future kingdom which is closer to orthodox Christianity, and therefore the possibility of a concern with the concept of the promised land.

The author, in fact, presents two reasons for holding this belief. First, the resurrection of "the Son of Man" is put forward as a basis for the elect's resurrection (46:3-47:10; cf. 1 Corinthians 15:12). Second, a reference to the appearance of Moses and Elijah during the transfiguration "demonstrates a continuity between the believer deceased and resurrected (48:3-11; cf. Mark 9:2-8)." It is not at all clear, as Malcolm L. Peel asserts, that this treatise contains the heretical teaching that the resurrection is already past (cf. 2:18). Nor is it clear, as he also argues, that the resurrection of the body which this treatise discusses involves a "spiritual flesh."[11]

---

[9] Malcolm L. Peel, Nag Hammadi Library, p. 50.

[10] Werner Foerster points to the difficulty in determining which resurrection the author had in mind. Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts, 2 vols., trans. Robert McLaklan Wilson, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, (I)1972, (II) 1974, vol. 2, p. 71 (hereafter cited as Gnosis); cf. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 122-123.

[11] Malcolm L. Peel, Nag Hammadi Library, p. 50; idem, "Resurrection, the Treatise on," IDBS, p. 741, sec. b.

There is, in fact, good reason to infer that this treatise maintains a tension between the realized and future resurrected life of the elect, similar to that in Paul and the Pauline writings. The author's use of Pauline mysticism in this respect is not unlike that found in Romans?, Philippians, Ephesians and Colossians (cf. Romans 6:5-14; 8:17; Colossians 1:11-12, 15-20; Ephesians 2:5-6; Philippians 3:8-11). The passage is as follows (45:15-46:1).

> The Savior swallowed up death -- (of the)...you are not reckoned as being ignorant -- for he put aside the world which is perishing. He transformed (himself) into an imperishable Aeon and raised himself up, having swallowed the visible by the invisible, and he gave us the way of our immortality. Then, indeed, as the Apostle said [cf. Romans 8:17, Ephesians 2:5-6].
>
> 'We suffered with him, and we arose with him, and we went to heaven with him.'
>
> Now if we are manifest in this world wearing him, we are that one's beams, and we are embraced by him until our setting, that is to say, our death in this life. We are drawn to heaven by him, like beams by the sun, not being restrained by anything. This is the spiritual resurrection which swallows up the psychic in the same way as the fleshly.

In contrast to this section in which there is an emphasis on the realized eschatology of a spiritual resurrection, the author affirms the future resurrection of the dead (46:5-10). He does this in language which heightens the materiality of this future resurrection. The author does this in contrast to the teaching in 1 Corinthians which maintains that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (15:50)." Indeed, the emphasis in 1 Corinthians is that the body of the believer "is sown a physical body" but raised "a spiritual body" -- "if there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body (15:44)." As John Robinson pointed out, "neither Paul nor any other New Testament writer speaks or could speak of the 'resurrection of the flesh (σάρξ)'...but of the body (σῶμα)."[12] Yet, in the Treatise on the Resurrection, it is the believer's flesh which is promised resurrection. The passages which support this interpretation are as follows (47:1-10; 48:5-20):

---

[12] John Robinson, "Resurrection in the NT," IDB, vol. 4, p. 52, sec. 2, b.

> Therefore, never doubt concerning the resurrection, my son Rheginos. For if you were not existing in flesh, you received flesh when you entered this world. Why will you not receive flesh when you ascend into the Aeon?
> ...For if you remember reading in the Gospel that Elijah appeared and Moses with him, do not think the resurrection is an illusion. It is no illusion, but it is truth. Indeed, it is more fitting to say that the world is an illusion, rather than the resurrection which has come into being through our Lord the Savior Jesus Christ.

It should be noted, moreover, that the author encourages the believer to act as if he were already risen (49). This is not to say that the author believes the resurrection has already taken place. Rather, the tension is heightened between that which is to come and that which the believer may now enjoy. The argument, again, is similar to that of Paul (Romans 6:5-14; 1 Corinthians 15:58).

One question remains: Does the goal of the future resurrection involve in any way the concept of the promised land? The answer, must be made in the negative. For the ultimate goal of the elect is "restoration to the Pleroma," as in the Gospel of Truth. It is true that the Pleroma in the Gospel of Truth is presented, at times, in a way which very nearly parallels the kingdom of God described in 1 Corinthians 15:28. For the Pleroma is described as something to come in which there is rest in him who is at rest (35). It is in this (rest) that the elect "shall come to be, to be concerned at all times with the Father of the all and the true brothers (43)." Yet the Pleroma is decidedly a technical term in this work and serves as an eternal sphere signifying the fulness of the Diety in which the elect seed are restored to the Divine Source. There is no reason, therefore, to assume that the concept of the promised land was in any way significant to the author of the Treatise on the Resurrection.

Another writing, the Apocryphon of James, deserves to be mentioned. Although it is possible that this work is of Egyptian provenance and belongs to the early third century, it could have originated near the end of the second century.[13] This writing frequently mentions the kingdom of God or of heaven and the concept of reigning in the kingdom (2; 3; 5; 8; 10; 12; 14; reigning, 10). There is, however, an emphasis on the present reality of the kingdom which is received through _gnosis_ (8). Neither the concept of a future kingdom nor the concept of the promised land in any orthodox sense emerge as a possibility in the teaching of this writing.

The last writing in the group which shows an affinity with the Valentinian type of Christian Gnosticism is the _Tripartite Tractate_. This work uses several terms which, in the orthodox Christian writings, sometimes involved the concept of the promised land.

According to this author, the Logos, which is both the Bride and the Kingdom, created preexistant images and places such as the kingdom (like a city), Paradise, and the region where the Church preexisted (96-100).[14] He created for the archons a kingship to the ends of the earth (100). He established and promised for those who obey him rests, paradises, and kingdoms (102). Further, the Logos created man, and planted paradise as a garden for him (106). Subsequently, man was expelled from the garden, but this was for his own good inasmuch as men needed time until the good could be received (107). Further, the righteous Hebrews and the prophets, not through imagination or esoteric thinking, but by the power which was at work in them, the Savior, preserved "the testimony of the one who is great, made by their fathers who were looking for the hope and the hearing (111-113; cf. 1 Peter 1:10-11)." Further, the Logos let "himself be conceived and born as an infant, in body and soul (115)." Moreover, "the Savior was a bodily image of the unitary one, ...the totality;" which was held under sin by the will that some might be saved (117). Indeed, the psychics are not far from "the hope according to the promises (119)," and if they confess the Lord and share in the suffering, they will have a share along with the spiritual in the hope of the Church (118; 119; 121). For the Church, the future restoration will take place at one time, and when Christ is all in all, angels and men will receive the kingdom which is in Christ (123-133).

---

[13] Francis E. Williams, _Nag Hammadi Library_, p. 29.

[14] Admittedly this concept is confusing.

The references to the historical realities associated with the concept of the promised land are obvious. Yet, the ultimate goal of the elect is a restoration to silence and pure light (124), and their bodies remain on earth (135) when the "Pleroma pulls them up in the greatness of the generosity and (the) sweetness of the aeon which preexists (136)." Throughout this writing, moreover, the meaning of these terms are substantially altered so as to be divorced from the concept of the promised land in any meaningful way. They serve only as a thin veil for the speculations of an other worldly hermeneutic. The indifference of apocalypticism to the restraints of history has completely given way to the negation of history through the cosmic myth of gnosticism.

OTHER TYPES OF GNOSTICISM

Most of the writings in this group offer very little in their reference to anything which could have been associated with the concept of the promised land. Both the Thought of Norea and The Thunder, Perfect Mind contain nothing at all. In the Sophia of Jesus Christ, the rest which the elect receive is called the kingdom, but it is not altogether clear what this means (118-119). The writing Melchizedek maintains that the body, suffering and resurrection of Christ were real, but the work has so many lacunae it is impossible to say anything else about it which could indicate an interest in the concept of the promised land. The Dialogue of the Savior teaches that the elect will rest in heaven -- a place of pure light which cannot be seen in the flesh (120; 132). Further, it maintains that the elect after they have received garments of light and entered the bridal chamber of heaven, will rule over the archons (138). This, however, is in a sense similar to that given it in the Tripartite Tractate and has no real connection with the traditions associated with the concept of the promised land.

The Apocalypse of Paul offers, perhaps, a little more. Paul is taken by the Holy Spirit up to the seventh heaven where he sees an old man (God?) who is (surrounded?) by light and (whose garment) was white. The old man asks Paul, "Where are you going, Paul?" Paul replies, "I am going down to the world of the dead in order to lead captive the captivity that was led captive inthe captivity of Babylon (28; cf. Ephesians 4:8)." This could indicate a concern for the restoration of the Jews of the Babylonian captivity to the kingdom which was expected in the prophesies of Third Isaiah. Indeed, the imagery of Third Isaiah was substantially apocalyptic, having little significant anchorage in history. Perhaps, for this author, there was a concern that this captivity should experience the promise of blessing in theland in the form of God's kingdom in the new heavens and new earth (cf. Isaiah 65: 17-25). This however, remains pure speculation. For nothing else in this apocalypse supports this.

Both the First and Second Apocalypses of James, which may have originated in Syria or Palestine, are concerned with subjects associated with the theme of the promised land. In the First Apocalypse of James it is possible the author intended to indicate that the realities of Judaism were not significant for the elect. There is, moreover, the idea that the nature of Jerusalem was then as it always had been -- unworthy of God's chosen. Jerusalem, therefore, is rejected as having many archons who cause the elect to be persecuted (25; 37-38). There is a reference to a concept of inheritance associated with Jerusalem and her "two sons," but the passage is indecisive because of a number of lacunae. The likelihood is that the concept of the promised land is not present (37-38).

In the Second Apocalypse of James the inheritance and promises of a good father are contrasted with those of a bad father (52-56). The elect are promised that they will become kings and reign (5-6), and this, perhaps, after a resurrection if the plea "bring me from a tomb alive (63)" has this significance. Yet, nothing of certainty can be concluded in deference to the concept of the land because these passages are insufficient in themselves to indicate the kind of reign or the kind of resurrection that is put forward in this apocalypse. In light of the Tripartite Tractate and the orthodox writings of the Letter of

Polycarp and 2 Timothy it is evident that the concept of reigning did not always carry with it the significance it has in the Revelation of John.

One final work deserves attention, the Gospel of Thomas. It may have originated in the East. Jacques-E. Menard suggests Edessa.[15] Helmut Koester points to Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia as equal possibilities.[16] Berthold Altanar indicates that while Egypt is possible, it is probable that it was written in Syria, "wo der Apostel Judas Thomas besonders geschatzt war."[17] It is, however, not Thomas, but James the Just who is especially singled out as the one who would be great over the other apostles (logion 12). Further, the fact that the Sabbath, not Sunday, was to be kept and the accusation that the Pharisees had hidden the keys of knowledge -- i.e. the oral part of the law -- as Menard has pointed out -- would make Egypt an unlikely candidate. The date of composition of some of the logia may have been as early as the second half of the first century according to Koester. The original Greek (or possibly Syriac or Aramaic) of the whole may have been penned near the middle of the second century and certainly before 200 A.D.

There is general agreement among scholars that the author was a Jewish Christian. Indeed, there is ample evidence of this throughout the writing. Whether or not the writing originally reflected Gnostic beliefs is a matter of dispute. Henri-Charles Puech concludes with some reservation that it does not seem "to be either exclusively or originally the work of a Gnostic."[18] Altaner and Menard regard it as

---

[15] Menard, "Thomas, Gospel of," IDBS, p. 902; cf. L. W. Barnard, "The Origin and Emergence of the Church in Edessa during the First Two Centuries," Vigiliae Christianae, 22, 1968, p. 165; Quispel, "Gnosticism and the New Testament," p. 66; H. J. W. Drijvers "Quq and the Quqites: An Unknown Sect in Edessa in the Second Century A.D.," Numen, 14, 1967, p.104.

[16] Koester, Nag Hammadi Library, p. 117.

[17] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 128.

[18] Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, p. 305.

Gnostic, at least in part, without reservation.

Three points may be discussed in the Gospel of Thomas which are pertinent to our theme: The possibility of a reference to a resurrection which, consequently, could indicate a concept of the kingdom that included an inaugural messianic age; the rejection of Israel after the flesh as recipients of the kingdom and possibly the promises; the emphasis or the lack of it on the nature of the kingdom as a present reality.

In logion 5 of the text, as we have it preserved in the second Codex of Nag Hammadi, there is no reference to the resurrection. The passage reads:

> Jesus said, "Recognize what is in your sight, and that which is hidden from you will become plain to you. For there is nothing hidden which will not become manifest.

Puech, however, has pointed to two variations of this logion.[19] In Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654, lines 27-31, the final clause if expanded reads:

> Jesus says (...lies (before) thine eye and (...from thee, will be revealed (...nothing (?) is hidden that (will) not (be) manifest, and buried that (will) not (be raised up) (?)

The last part, it should be noted, is not certain, as Wilhelm Schneemelcher points out.[20] Further, Puech asserts that a Christian burial shroud (fifth or sixth century) from ancient Oxyrphynchus reproduces the final clause of POx 654 as follows:[21]

> λέγει Ἰησοῦσ ὀῦκ ἐστιν τεθαμμένον ὃ ὀῦκ ἐγερθήσεται

That the original saying could have made reference to the resurrection is therefore possible. If this were true, it is not inconceivable that the nature of the kingdom originally presented in this writing could have been such as to include the possibility of an inaugural messianic kingdom. Indeed, the reference in logion two concerning the promise of the believer's reign may have pointed to a reign in the messianic kingdom. This, however, is pure speculation. Even if this were true, the author or redactor of the Nag Hammadi text has not alluded to a resurrection in logion five, and the reign of the elect in logion two is not over any part of the earth, but rather "over the All," a concept quite reminiscent of Valentinian Gnosticism.

---

[19] Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, pp. 299-300.

[20] Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, p. 102.

[21] Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, p. 300.

Three logia refer to the rejection of Israel as the people of God (40; 65; 109). It is not clear whether the inheritance of the Jews -- the kingdom -- is meant to be that of the elect. Logion 40 seems to suggest that the grapevine -- i.e. the Jews -- from the beginning were unsound, for they were planted outside of the Father. They were, therefore, finally uprooted. Moreover, as is the case in Matthew and Mark, the land of their planting is not significant.

Similar to this, logion 109, which reflects the parable of the hidden treasure (cf. Matthew 13:44), indicates that the son who inherited the field from his father was not aware it contained a treasure. He therefore sold it to someone else. When the buyer went plowing in the field he discovered the treasure and began to lend money at interest. This, perhaps, is an allusion to the inheritance promised Abraham and lost by the Jews who did not recognize it in Christ. Whatever the symbols may represent, this parable differs remarkably from that in Matthew 13:44. In Matthew, a man finds a treasure in a field, and aware of the value of his discovery, he sells all that he has and purchases the field. In this logion, however, the treasure is not simply found by a man, rather it is lost by the blood-heir of the field. The point seems to be that Israel never experienced the treasure of the kingdom which the believer discovered. There is, moreover, no emphasis on the field in which the treasure was buried.

Logion 65 is perhaps more telling in its omission of a detail concerning the parable of the vineyard. The logion faithfully reproduces the parable of the wicked tenants in their effort to gain the inheritance of the vineyard even if it meant killing the owner's own son. In all three evangelists, the vineyard is significant for it is the inheritance which the son will receive (Mark 12:1-12; Matthew 21:33-41; Luke 20:9-19). Clearly, the most obvious referent of the vineyard is the

UMI

kingdom of Israel -- i.e. the land and all the realities associated with blessing in the land. All three evangelists add the final detail which involves the judgment of the wicked tenets: the vineyard is "given to other tenants," with Matthew adding that these other tenants "will give the owner the fruits of their seasons." This, however, is conspicuously missing in logion 65. A clear reference to the kingdom -- pictured in terms of land -- is omitted by the author of this writing. It obviously held no significance for him.

Perhaps, there was an effort to ignore the referent because the local theological arena, such as Palestine, made much of the subject of the land of Israel. The land of Canaan was certainly a prominent issue in the war of Bar Cochba in 132-135 A.D.[22] Indeed, if the Gospel of Thomas were penned in 140 A.D. in Palestine or an area populated by Christian Jews who cherished the hope of regaining the Holy Land, there might be good reason to suppress any hope of this kind of inheritance if it were regarded as a misplaced hope. There is, in fact, a good reason to believe that the author endeavored to suppress the hope of a coming kingdom -- even more so perhaps in this Jewish form.

Two passages emphasize that the believer should not hope for a coming future kingdom but recognize that the kingdom has come. In logia 51 and 113, the disciples are represented as originally misunderstanding the nature of the kingdom. Similar to the passage in Acts 1:6 -- in which the disciples want to know when the kingdom will be restored to Israel -- they are presented asking when will the kingdom come. The answer given them is that what they are looking for has already come -- "the kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth" (113), "and not only men, but they themselves do not recognize it" (51).

---

[22] Michael Grant, Jews in Roman World, pp. 242-260, 274-275. As for the Jewish Revolt of A.D. 115 and 117, it is difficult to determine a reason for its occurrence. There is evidence in that there was fighting in Cyrenaica, Egypt, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia. The destruction of the city of Salamis and the pagan holy places made the revolt an ignominy in the eyes of the world. In agreement with V. A. Tcherikover, Alexander Fuks believed the revolt was rooted in messianic hopes. "Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in A.D. 115-117," Journal of Roman Studies, 51, 1961, pp. 103-104.

We may conclude, therefore, that in respect to the kingdom of God, the author endeavored to explain that what is meant, essentially, is not a future, apocalyptic kingdom, especially one centered in the realities of Judaism, as pictured in the Jewish scriptures -- but a present kingdom, in the sovereignty of Christ where the believer may now experience his repose (logion 90). When the believer discovers this he will be amazed and rule over the All (logion 2; cf. Gospel of the Hebrews, Clement of Alexandria Stromata ii 9.45).[23] The concept of the land, consequently, is rejected by the author of the Gospel of Thomas.

This concludes our examination of the catalogue of literature in which the concept of promised blessing in the land has no apocalyptic significance for the hope of the believer. Whether it is ignored, rejected, replaced, or transformed into something substantially different, it is no longer a cherished hope of those who consider themselves the people of God.

We now turn our attention to those writings in which the concept of the promised land endures as an eternal inheritance of the Church -- the true Israel of God.

---

[23] Philipp Vielhauer, "Jewish-Christian Gospels" in New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, p. 164.

PART 3

LITERATURE OF SECOND CENTURY IN WHICH THE PROMISE OF THE LAND IS EXPECTED IN ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL OR APOCALYPTIC SENSE

CHAPTER 1

ASIA MINOR

REVELATION

The Revelation, an apocalypse in epistolary form, is probably the theological work of one author who ingeniously used material from the Jewish scriptures, the pseudepigrapha, pagan mythologies, and traditions of the early Church to put forward his message.[1] The work, according to the careful evaluation of Elisabeth Fiorenza, "gives meaning to the suffering of the Christian communities, not by reference to the divine plan of history, but by an understanding of the present from the horizon of the future."[2] Indeed, it is God who rules with Jesus Christ even in severe persecution, and Satan's power which has been broken by the work of Christ, though awesome, is limited and will ultimately be destroyed.

Unlike other Jewish apocalyptic writings, Revelation is probably not pseudonymous, but is advanced as the composition of a certain John (1:1, 4, 9; 22:8). Nowhere in the work does the author claim to be the Apostle John or the Presbyter John. He does not imply that he personally knew Jesus during Jesus' earthly ministry. Two passages in Revelation which are usually used to demonstrate that the author considered the Apostle John as someone "other than himself" should not be pressed in this direction too strongly however (18:20; 21:14).

Unfortunately, the identity of this John is at this point a complete mystery. Nothing of any certainty can be maintained. Although it is extremely unlikely, it is not inconceivable that the author was a literary genius who both wrote the Gospel and letters of John, and then purposefully used "the repetition of stereotyped formulas and the archaizing, Hebraizing style" to achieve his desired effect in this apocalypse.[3] The greatest probability, however, is that the author was a Jewish Palestinian Christian prophet who emigrated to Asia Minor and is to be differentiated from the author or authors of the Fourth Gospel and letters of John, inasmuch as there is a considerable difference in the use of language.[4]

---

[1] Elisabeth Fiorenza, "The Eschatology and Composition of the Apocalypse," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 30, 1968, pp. 537-539 (hereafter cited as "Eschatology of the Apocalypse").

[2] Elisabeth Fiorenza, "Revelation, Book of," IDBS, p. 745, sec. 2, a.

[3] Fiorenza, "Revelation, Book of," IDBS, p. 744, sec. 1, a. This is not to imply that Fiorenza embraces this position but merely to show the absurdity to which one can take the literary talents of an author.

As early as the third century Dionysius of Alexandria argued that the Revelation differed from the Gospel and epistle in both style and theological perspective (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, vii. 25. 7-27). As Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. points out in his discussion of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, a Presbyter John was proposed as the author of Revelation on the basis of some statements in a work, Oracles of the Lord, a composition of Papias in the first half of the second century.[5] It is not known, however, to which John -- the apostle or presbyter -- Eusebius believed that Papias ascribed the book of Revelation. All that can be maintained with any confidence is that the seer John who wrote Revelation was "a servant of Jesus Christ" whose sense of companionship and commission compelled him to address the communities in Asia Minor.

The date of the composition of Revelation has been variously assessed by scholars. The primary reasons put forward for a date earlier than the reign of Vespasian are: the possibility that Revelation indicates the Temple was still standing at the time of writing (6:9; 11:1 ff.); the interpretation of the events described in chapter twelve in terms of the flight of Christians to Pella; and the proposition that the statements concerning the seven heads, the ten kings, and the beast are best understood to signify the historical context of the first seven Roman emperors. These reasons, however, are not altogether convincing.[6]

It is not necessary to interpret the references to the Temple quite so literally. The phrase in 6:9 "the souls under the altar" does not easily lend itself as a referent to the Herodian Temple. It simply signifies a heavenly altar before the heavenly throne (cf. 8:1-5). The passage in 11:1 ff. regarding the measuring of the Temple may refer to the Herodian Temple. It is not at all clear, however, what relationship this reference has to Revelation as a whole. The same questions may be raised concerning the significance of chapter twelve. Even if a reference to the event of the flight to Pella is intended -- and it is not clear that this is so -- it is not at all necessary to conclude that the writing of Revelation occurred at this time.

---

[4] R. H. Charles, Revelation of St. John, vol. 1, p. xliv.

[5] Shepherd, "The Gospel According to John," in Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, pp. 708-709.

[6] Cf. Robinson, Redating the New Testament, pp. 221 ff.

The allusions to the succession of Roman emperors and the identity of the beast are very problematic. There is no consensus among scholars regarding the succession of emperors intended. Should the enumeration begin with Julius or Augustus? Or does the first head refer to the first emperor to come to power after the resurrection of Christ -- Caligula? It is probable that the Nero redivivus myth is reflected in chapters thirteen and seventeen. Yet, it is difficult to determine just what significance the author gave to this myth. Does it point to Nero or a recrudescense of the same kind of spirit intensified to beastly proportions in a later emperor? Is the author anticipating or looking back on and interpreting this particular element of his apocalyptic schemata?

This brings us to the nature of the persecution associated with the revived demonic force of the beast. The persecution described seems best understood as a confrontation of the Church with the imperial cult. This does not fit well with any persecution before that of Domitian. It may be true, as John Robinson has recently argued, that the most cruel persecution of Christians in this era was that under Nero. This, however, does not really bring us any closer to a conclusion of a date under Nero or before Domitian.[7] It is perfectly possible that both the madness and cruelty of Nero's persecution were used to derogate the nature of the persecution resulting from the impositions of the imperial cult in Asia Minor.

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 230 ff.

There is a greater probability that Revelation was written, as is attested by the earliest tradition regarding its date, near the end of the reign of Domitian.[8] Bo Reicke pointed out that while the imperial cult flourished in Asia Minor from the time of Augustus, it was especially promoted during the final years of Domitian in the capitol of Ephesus which received a special imperial temple with a gigantic statue of Domitian.[9] In this respect, the conclusion of Werner Kümmel is justified and to the point:

> Thus it was precisely in the province of Asia, the classical land of the imperial cult, that at the time of Domitian all the prerequisites were present for a severe conflict between Christianity and the state cult, which is what Revelation has in view...[10]

It is important to note that Domitian was acclaimed as "our lord and god" upon coins in the East -- an appellation which is attributed to Christ in a work which was most likely published in Asia near the same time (cf. John 20:28).[11]

There are other reasons which support a date of about A.D. 95-96 for the composition of Revelation. Charles Brütsch, who is in substantial agreement with Caird on the date of Revelation, recently advanced Caird's essential points in a very convincing manner. Regarding the catastrophic events in the years after A.D. 60 reflected in the Apocalypse of John Brütsch made the following observation:

---

[8] Irenaeus, Against Heresies, v. 30.3. The translation used throughout Part 3 is the following: The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; rev. A. Cleaveland Coxe, American reprint of the Edinburgh ed., 1885, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, vol. 1. The text used by this translation and consulted is the following: W. Wigan Harvey, Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis: libros quinque adveresus haereses, 2 vols., Cantabrigia: Typis Academicis, 1857 (republished, Ridgewood: Gregg Press, 1965).

[9] Reicke, New Testament Era, p. 279. But Magie recommends caution. Roman Rule in Asia Minor, vol. 1, p. 572 and vol. 2, pp. 1432-1434.

[10] Kümmel, INT, p. 467.

[11] Reicke, New Testament Era, p. 279; Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor, vol. 1, p. 577.

> ...die Erdbeben um das Jahr 60 (Tac., Ann. 14, 27), die demütigende Niederlage des römischen Heeres an der Ostfront durch den Partherkönig Vologaes im Jahr 62 (Tac., Ann. 15, 13-17), die Christenverfolgung nach dem Brand Roms, 64 (Tac., Ann. 15, 144), den 4 Jahre lang dauernded Schrecken des judischen Krieges, der 70 mit dem Fall Jerusalems endete, den Selbstmord Neros im Jahr 68 mit dem nachfolgenden politischen Chaos..., den Ausbruch des Vesuvs, 79, der nicht nur die Luxusstatten der Bucht von Neapel zerstorte, sondern...die Menschen die einbrechende Zersetzung der ganzen physikalischen Ordnung befurchten liess (Plin., Ep. 6, 16), und die ernste Hungersnot von 92 (Suet. Dom. 7)[12]

Despite Robinson's recent careful and thorough argument for the composition of Revelation before A.D. 70, the weight of the evidence therefore strongly suggests that Revelation was written in A.D. 95-96.

Revelation is unequivocal in affirming that the people of God will receive the blessings and salvation which has been promised to them. One of the blessings singled out is that of promised blessing in the land during the reign of Christ and the victorious saints in the millennium. Although the emphasis is on the Church as the recipient of these promises, a significant attempt to describe the Church in terms of the historic people of God, Israel, implies that the Old Covenant saints are not to be excluded from the enjoyment of these promises. In Revelation, however, the relationship of the Church to the Old Covenant saints of Israel is somewhat problematic, and deserves some attention before proceeding with the examination of the concept of the land _per se_.[13]

Elisabeth Fiorenza has recently challenged the different historical (_zeitgeschichtlich_) and historical-theological (_geschichtstheologisch und heilsgeschichtlich_) interpretations which maintain that the contents of

---

[12] Charles Brutsch, _Die Offenbarung Jesu Christi: Johannes-Apokalypse_, 3 vols. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970, vol. 3, pp. 119-120.

[13] An example of perceiving the Church in terms not continuous with the Old Covenant saints is the work of Samuel Sandmel, _The Several Israels and an Essay: Religion and Modern Man_, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971, pp. 29-58.

Revelation are ordered according to a temporal-historical sequence.[14] Fiorenza proposed that the main concern of Revelation is eschatology with its contents structured according to individual themes, rather than a temporal-historical sequence. Further, she asserted that the focus on "what is" and "what is yet to come" in Revelation, is not history but God's kingdom.[15] Her interpretation, enables some of the central apocalyptic sections in Revelation to be understood in a new perspective. She seems however, to create between the saints of the Old Covenant and the Church an artificial barrier which is reminiscent of Dispensationalism.

Fiorenza has criticized the heilsgeschichtlich interpretation of Revelation which emphasizes the continuity of the Old Covenant people of God with the Church. For an example of this position, she referred to Mathias Rissi's exegetical study of Revelation in which chapters seven, eleven, twelve, fifteen, and twenty-one were interpreted -- unjustifiably so, in the view of Fiorenza -- as referring to Israel.[16] In contrast to this position, she singled out Eduard Schweizer's book, Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament, as a work which correctly evaluates Revelation's sense of continuity or the lack of it between Israel and the Church.[17]

It is possible that in her attempt to emphasize Revelation's lack of emphasis on a historical line of time between Israel and the Church, she has obscured Revelation's concept of the essential continuity between these two groups as the people of God. Certainly, the two scholars to whom she referred are not as far apart as she proposed in their interpretation of this point.

The point which Eduard Schweizer made concerning the continuity between Israel and the Church is not unlike the position of Rissi. Schweizer maintained that in Revelation the emphasis is on the Church as the new Israel the people of God. Further, he pointed out in commenting on chapter eleven that, in Revelation in general, there is no reflection of a temporal-lineal connection between historic Israel and the Church as in Romans eleven. The emphasis is that the (true) Israel is no longer the Semitic nation of

---

[14] Fiorenza, "Eschatology of the Apocalypse," pp. 539-552.

[15] Ibid., p. 553.

[16] Ibid., p. 541, n. 23.

[17] Ibid.

Palestine, but rather a community drawn from all peoples:

> Dabei fehlt jede Reflexion über das vorchristliche Israel, auch der paulinische Gedanke eines innerhalb des jüdischen Volkes erwählten Rest-Israel...Das Jerusalem Gottes liegt nicht mehr in Palästina, es ist uberall, wo glaübenede Gemeinde lebt, so wie Israel nicht mehr eine semitsche Nation ist, sondern eine Schar aus allen Völkern (5, 9 ff; 7, 9).[18]

Yet, while Schweizer maintained that in Revelation the emphasis is on the Church as something beyond historic Israel or the people of God, he understood that there was present in Revelation the concept of the Church as a legitimate continuation of Israel:

> Hier [Revelation 11] ist die Gemeinde [the Church] nicht mehr nur die legitime Weiterentwicklung Israels, sie ist Israel.[19]

The point Schweizer made, is that in Revelation, the Church is not simply the continuation of Israel, it is something beyond that. Schweizer however, did not deny a continuity between Israel and the Church. In Revelation, the emphasis is not on a temporal connection between Israel and the Church, but on the ontogenetic relationship of the two as ultimately comprising the one people of God.

The position of Mathias Rissi is similar in this respect. He raised the same question concerning the sense of continuity between Israel and the Church in his discussion of Revelation eleven:

> And for this reason, too, the earthly Jerusalem no longer bears the title of God's holy city, but rather the shameful designation which links it with the godless city, the whore Babylon, 'the great city' (11.8; cf. 14.8; 16.19; 17.18), as well as the names of the godless and of the enemies of Israel in the Old Testament, 'Sodom and Egypt' (11.8). It is only the new Jerusalem that rightly bears the title 'the holy city'. There is thus a radical break in the history of Israel, which throws its continuity utterly into question.[20]

---

[18] Eduard Schweizer, Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament, Abhandlungen zür Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 35, Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959, p. 119.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Rissi, Future of the World, p. 56.

Rissi, further, attempted to maintain a sense of continuity between Israel and the Church and showed that the New Jerusalem and above all Christ, fulfilled the hopes of historic Israel and the Church when ultimately all of the people of God would enjoy the New Age:

> John testifies to a great hope for the return of Israel into its own city, into its own gates. It will in the end once again be the twelve tribes, created anew and redeemed. With that, the prophetic promises of the final return of the people of God are taken up and exceeded. Just as the remnant of Israel formed the basis of the church (7.1-8), so the renewed Israel will be the foundation of the new world.[21]

It would seem, therefore, that in the interpretation of both Schweizer and Rissi, a historical connection between Israel and the Church is assumed. The emphasis however is on the present nature of the Church as a community transcending the scope of the Semitic nation.[22]

It should be noted that the thesis of Elisabeth Fiorenza, which seeks to understand the literary composition of Revelation as thematically arranged, does not in itself exclude the possibility of Revelation containing references which imply a sense of historical continuity between Israel and the Church. It is not necessary that the book be structured according to a lineal-historical-temporal sequence, for it to advance the concept that the Church had both a historical-temporal and an essential relationship with the saints of the Old Covenant (cf. Paul's argument in Romans 4). That there is some degree of historical perspective in Revelation, in fact, seems to be granted by Fiorenza herself:

> If our thesis is correct, that Ap [sic], in contrast to Jewish Apocalyptic, intends not so much to give a survey of history as to present a prophetic interpretation of the persecuted situation of the Christian community from the viewpoint of the eschatological future...[23]

---

[21] Ibid., p. 74.

[22] Cf. George Ladd, Theology of N. T., p. 627-629.

[23] Fiorenza, "Eschatology of the Apocalypse," pp. 561-562.

Indeed, in the revised and expanded version of the original German edition of Die Zukunft der Welt, Mathias Rissi accepts this aspect of Fiorenza's thesis without altering his position on the historical perspective in Revelation.[24]

Revelation is significant for this study because it affirms the promise of the land. In it, the blessings and salvation which are promised the Church (2-3) are presented in a way which reflects the fulfillment of the promises and apocalyptic hopes associated with the Patriarchal, Mosaic and Davidic covenants (14-15; 20-22). The Church, not merely as the continuation of Israel but as Israel, receives salvation and blessing under the sovereignty of the Davidic King in the land -- a kingdom in a land which ultimately becomes the kingdom of God in a new earth and a new heaven. It is ultimately in Eternity that heaven is joined with earth. Earth is epitomized by the New Jerusalem, and there is the picture of the tree of life and the land which was first promised to man for his salvation and blessing -- Paradise, the Garden of Eden. The work of the Alpha and Omega has brought together the first and the last -- that which was lost, Eden, and that which was promised forever, Canaan. At last, all the people of God enjoy a place to commune with and worship God forever.

Throughout Revelation, the relationship of the Church and Judaism to the true Israel is interpreted in respect to the confession of Jesus as Christ, the Son of God. A real Jew, according to the author, is not one who is socially or religiously a Jew, or one who holds to any esoteric mixture of Jewish doctrine, but rather one who acknowledges the claims of Christ. "Jews" who do not do this are under the dominion of Satan (2:9; 3:9). More than this, Revelation heightens the tension between Israel according to faith (the Church) and ethnic Judaism.

The nation of Israel, according to Revelation, has become so apostate by her continual rejection of Christ that she has been rejected as the Israel of God. This is emphasized in chapter eleven. In 11:8, Jerusalem is given an unusual appellative -- "the great city"

---

[24] Rissi, Future of the World, p. 88, n. 6.

(ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη). This is a term used elsewhere by the author to designate Babylon, the epitome of the satanic system (16:19; 17:1, 5, 18; 18:2, 9). Jerusalem -- now "the great city" in contrast to "holy city" -- is allegorically depicted as Sodom and Egypt. Although the language used is unusually strong in the rejection of Jerusalem, it is not unprecedented. In Isaiah 1:9 ff., Jerusalem is called Sodom and Gomorrah; and in Ezekiel, Jerusalem is depicted as a harlot worse than her sisters, Sodom and Samaria (16:35-52).[25] It would seem, that in Revelation, ethnic Israel no longer has any spiritual significance apart from Christ, and is a part of the satanic and political system which without repentance will suffer the judgment of God.

In contrast to the apostasy of ethnic Israel, Revelation emphasizes that the Church is the true Israel of God. Although there are many implications of this throughout the book, a few may be noticed to make this clear. One way that has already been noted, is the declaration that a real Jew is one who acknowledges Christ as Lord and God (2-3). Another that designates the Church as the true Israel is the vision of the sealing of the elect community (7:1-8).

Revelation describes the sealed community in language which is intense in Jewish color: "a hundred and forty-four thousand, out of every tribe of the sons of Israel, twelve thousand" from each of twelve tribes of Israel. Yet, there is good reason to believe that John intended that this community represent the ideal spiritual Israel -- the Church consisting of both Jews and Gentiles.[26] The author has already taken pains to put forward what really constitutes a Jew -- one must above all be a Christian (2-3).

The enumeration itself of the twelve tribes indicates that this community signifies the Church as spiritual Israel. The list is irregular

---

[25] The particular combination of Sodom with Egypt as representing types of wickedness is alluded to in Wisdom 19:13-17, but there is no attempt here to apply this to Jerusalem.

[26] This concept of the Church as "the twelve tribes" is probably present in James 1:1.

UMI

and does not correspond to any in the books of the old covenant. Judah is seldom listed first. Dan, which heads the list in Ezekiel 48:1, is omitted altogether. The omission of Dan may be explained as the result of a conviction that the antichrist would arise out of Dan. The list of tribes, nevertheless, as we have it in Revelation seven does not accurately reflect what constituted historical Israel or any known previous list.

Another point may be made regarding the significance of this sealed community. Later in the book, a group of one hundred and forty-four thousand is discussed (14:1-5). This is almost certainly the same group which is envisioned in chapter seven. These elect (14:1-5) are depicted in very ideal terms (14:3b-5):

> No one could learn that song except the hundred and forty-four thousand who had been redeemed from the earth. It is these who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are chaste; it is these who follow the Lamb wherever he goes; these have been redeemed from mankind as first fruits for God and the Lamb, and in their mouth no lie was found, for they are spotless.

Although I know of no commentary that mentions Isaiah 56:3-7 in connection with this passage, it seems to reflect this passage in substance: the elect are not national Jews, but spiritual Jews; they are sexually pure; they are given a special, spiritual name; they appear on God's holy mountain. This corresponds remarkably well with the position of the author concerning the nature of a true Jew. A probable interpretation of Revelation 14:3-5, therefore, is one which recognized the sealed community as the Church, undefiled by the spiritual adultery of the imperial cult. This would show the Church in marked contrast to the heresy of the Nicolaitans and/or the false Jews who by means of a Jewish-Christian-Gnostic ethic found it comfortable to meet the demands of the imperial cult.[27] The very Jewish image of the sealed community emphasized that the victorious Church is the true Israel and spiritually undefiled by the imperial cult.

---

[27] On the influence of Jews in Asia Minor see A. F. J. Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity." New Testament Studies, 20, 1974, p. 438; Sherman E. Johnson, "Unsolved Questions about Early Christianity in Anatolia" in Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 33, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972, pp. 185 ff. The Jewish-Docetic-Gnostic heresy may have been related and condemned by John. See Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Jews in the Gospel of John: Another Level of Meaning," pp. 108-110; Elisabeth Fiorenza, "Revelation, Book of," IDBS, p. 746.

In Revelation twelve, the vision of the woman, the child, and the dragon serves to establish a continuity between believing Israel of the Old Covenant and believing Israel of the New Covenant -- the Church. It is difficult to determine, however, whether or not the Church is presented as the legitimate continuation of Israel in a temporal-historical sense or as an ontogenetic component with Israel comprising the whole people of God.

If a temporal-historical sequence is intended, we may understand the woman as first signifying Israel of the Old Covenant, from whom Jesus was born (12:1-6). Although the description of the "woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars" originally may have been a pagan myth about a sun goddess, it is easy to see how the author could associate this image with the Israel of the Old Covenant. By simply adding Joseph as the twelfth star of the second dream in Genesis thirty-seven we have a complete picture of Israel in the same terminology (Genesis 37:9-10):

> Then he dreamed another dream, and told it to his brothers, and said, 'behold, I have dreamed another dream; and behold, the sun, the moon, and eleven stars were bowing down to me.' But when he told it to his father and to his brothers, his father rebuked him, and said to him, 'What is this dream that you have dreamed? Shall I and your mother and your brothers indeed come to bow ourselves to the ground before you?'

The addition of the image of the woman to the sun, moon, and stars, could signify the women from Sarah to Mary who gave birth to the promised seed -- Christ. An interpretation such as that of S. Maclean Gilmour which simply understands the woman as a sun goddess "symbolizing her power over the destinies of mankind" seems incredible.[28]

The woman would next signify the Church which is persecuted by the dragon (12:10-17):

---

[28] S. MacLean Gilmour, "The Revelation of John," Interpreter's 1-Vol. Commentary, p. 959.

> Then the dragon was angry with the woman, and went off to make war on the rest of her offspring, on those who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus. And he stood on the sand of the sea. (12:17)

A temporal-historical continuity between Israel and the Church could, therefore, be clearly outlined here.

Another interpretation that does not recognize a historical emphasis may be possible. George Eldon Ladd has made an interesting proposal in this respect:

> The church is pictured as a gloriously adorned woman (Rev. 12:1). She is not the historical church on earth but the ideal church in heaven. As such, she is to be identified directly with neither Israel nor the church, yet includes both. As the heavenly, ideal people of God, she gives birth both to the Messiah (12:2, 5) and to the empirical church in history (12:17).[29]

Ladd suggests that this understanding of the woman is similar to the concept of the heavenly Jerusalem in Galatians 4:26-27 and Hebrews 12:22. Although the passage in Galatians seems to correspond closely with this interpretation, it is very difficult to see any parallel in the reference in Hebrews. This understanding of the woman in Revelation twelve would, nevertheless, recognize a real continuity between the saints of the Old Covenant and the Church. Indeed, this understanding of the Church enabled Paul to assert that the Church as the true Israel was therefore heir to the Old Covenant promises (Galatians 3-4; 6:16).

One final point can be made to demonstrate the emphasis that the Church is true Israel and associated with both the promises and saints of the Old Covenant. As Elisabeth Fiorenza proposes, the last two chapters of Revelation stand in close relationship with chapters two and three.[30] The promises made to the victorious saints in chapters two and three are realized in the new heaven and the new earth. The lake of fire, the second death, stands outside of the New Jerusalem and is the destination of the enemies of God. To this, therefore, are confined those who say they are Jews but are not. In contrast to this, the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem stand open to spiritual Israel and are the gateway to the ultimate destiny of the people of God. This is very close to the concept in the Letter to the Philadelphians of Bishop Ignatius where Jesus is the door through which both Old and New Covenant saints enter fellowship with God (9:1-2).[31]

---

[29] Ladd, Theology of N. T., p. 625.

[30] Fiorenza, "Revelation, Book of," IDBS, p. 744, sec. 1.

Several passages in Revelation reflect the fulfillment of the promise of blessing in the land associated with the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic covenants. As has been indicated previously in our discussion, the promises to the patriarchs were largely subsumed in the Davidic covenant, where they realized their greatest fulfillment in the empire of Solomon. This is the situation in Revelation where the essential elements of a promised seed and blessing in the land are fulfilled in the sovereign rule of Christ in the messianic kingdom. There are several passages in Revelation which bring forward these elements originally promised to Abraham (Genesis 12:1-7; 15; 17:1-8).

As we mentioned above, the vision in chapter twelve signifies that the Child who is born (Christ) is the promised heir of Abraham (12:1). Further, the fact that Christ shall rule as king (12:5), reflects the concept which P introduced into the patriarchal tradition in order to give a permanent validity to the Davidic covenant and to provide a more ancient and secure anchorage for the Davidic monarchy (Genesis 17).

Christ is elsewhere (Revelation 5:5) described as "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David (cf. Genesis 49:9-10; an obvious reflection of the Davidic tradition found in Isaiah 9:6-7; 11:1, 10). After the parousia of Christ, Satan will be bound, and both Christ and the victorious saints will reign in Jerusalem during the duration of the messianic kingdom --one thousand years (Revelation 20:1-10). With the inaugural messianic kingdom, therefore, the hope of promised blessing in the land is actualized in a splendor which exceeds even that of the great empire of Solomon. Not just the royal heir of the Davidic dynasty, but the victorious saints as well, reign in an era of international shalom; and Jerusalem is not only the theological and political capital of Israel, but of the whole world (cf. Ezekiel 5:5). At last, Jerusalem as the navel of the earth provides the spiritual life-line to the nations of the world in the messianic age -- an embryonic form, as it were, of the Age to Come.[32]

---

[31] Rissi, Future of the World, pp. 73-74.

This brings us to another aspect of the millenial reign and the promises associated with the patriarchal and Davidic traditions -- the relationship of Israel to the nations. In Revelation 12:5, the rule of the promised Christ is not limited to Canaan, but includes the nations, which he shall rule with a rod of iron (cf. Psalm 2:9). This reflects the concept of the promise of blessing in the land envisioned in Second Isaiah. Just as Yahweh called and blessed Abraham, he would restore and bless Zion (51:2-3). Even though Zion was as barren as Sarah had been, God would cause her seed of promise to possess not only the land of Canaan, but the nations. The promise of blessing in the land would transcend its historic significance and realize cosmic proportions because Yahweh is the God of the whole earth (Isaiah 54:1-5). It should be noted, moreover, that the expectation that Israel would one day stand preëminent among the nations was not held as a one-sided blessing. The preëminence of Israel would bring blessing to the nations as well. This idea has its roots in the promises associated with the Abrahamic tradition.

As we pointed out in Part 1, the Yahwist, after describing the downward trend of man toward hopelessness, provided a means of hope through Abraham and the promised seed (Genesis 12:1-4a).[33] Although the emphasis of the Yahwist is on the special election of Abraham and the promise of seed and land, the rest of mankind is not ignored. The promise to Abraham affirmed a beginning of the end of the curse and announced a new direction of promise and blessing for all mankind (Genesis 12:2-3):

---

[32] David Sperling, "Navel of the Earth," IDBS, pp. 621-623.

[33] Peter F. Ellis, The Yahwist: The Bible's First Theologian, Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1968, pp. 156-157.

> And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing....and by you all the families of the earth shall be blessed.

Clearly, the nations of the world would be blessed by God through Abraham and the nation Israel. It is not at all clear from this passage, however, what the nature of this blessing would be. For the author of Revelation, it probably meant that through Israel -- true Israel -- the nations would come to know and worship the one true God (Revelation 15:4). This concept is considerably more elaborate than its nascent form in the patriarchal tradition, and deserves some attention.

The concept of Israel as a source of blessing for the nations achieved its most enriched and articulate expression in the oracle of Isaiah 2:2-4 and Micah 4:1-4. The oracle represents one motif among four or five which were used to glorify Zion. The dating and relationship of these various motifs in the Zion tradition are very problematic; and it is not clear which prophet first gave utterance to this oracle. Ronald Clements argued for the ascription of the oracle to Isaiah rather than Micah; but von Rad, who described the oracle as Isaian in nature, seemed to leave the question open. Moreover, von Rad proposed that the Davidic and Zionic traditions were independent, existing side by side.[34] Although this is questionable concerning all the motifs of the Zion tradition, it is probable that it is true in respect to the particular motif reflected in this Isaian oracle. J. J. M. Roberts, in fact, suggests that the three motifs in the Zion tradition which probably predate the monarchy are the following: 1) the elevation of Yahweh above Canaanite gods; 2) the identification of Yahweh with Elyon; 3) Yahweh's world rule. Roberts argues that the date of composition of the tradition as it existed with both mythological and historical motifs -- a) the divine mountain, the paradisical river, the conquest of nations and b) the defeat of the nations, the pilgrimage of the nations -- would best suit the period after the importance of the Davidic monarchy had been established in regard to the nations and before the destruction of that monarchy.[35] The international commerce and syncretism after Solomon assumed the throne would have provided an historical basis for the two latter motifs. Ultimately, apocalyptic elements were added to the blended David-Zion tradition, and there resulted a mixture of ideas concerning both the messianic kingdom and the transhistorical kingdom of the New Age. Joachim Jeremias has discussed these latter aspects of the tradition in Jesus' Promise to the Nations.[36]

---

[34] Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p. 49, n. 3; von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, pp. 233-234.

It is probable then that this Zionic motif concerning the world rule of Yahweh had its roots in the patriarchal promises and was reshaped by the Davidic tradition in order to demonstrate how God would bless the nations through Israel. For the author of Revelation the positive response of the Gentiles to the proclamation of the gospel fulfilled this expectation. The mixture in the Church of both Jews and Gentiles was a strong indication that the promise to Abraham concerning the nations was in substance fulfilled, and the author could envision the messianic kingdom as the time in which this aspect of the patriarchal promise could be actualized to the extreme. The greatest expectations of the prophets and the books of the Old Covenant could be realized in the reign of the Seed and David par excellence, the Son of God.

Although the promises associated with the Davidic tradition best suited the emphasis of Revelation concerning the Church triumphant, the Mosaic tradition is also reflected in the book. Two things in Revelation give evidence of this: the doctrine of works and the reference to the song of Moses. It would be misleading to infer that the Law of Moses in opposition to the grace of the gospel is implied by the concept of "works" in Revelation. Nevertheless, the principle of the Mosaic covenant in respect to the promise of blessing in the land is reasserted in Revelation: the acquisition of the promises associated with salvation in the messianic age and the Age to Come are wholly contingent upon belief in Christ and obedience to the commandments of God (Revelation 2:2, 5, 13, 19, 23, 26; 3:8, 10, 14; 12:17; 14:12, 20:12, 22:12).

---

[35] Roberts, "Zion Tradition," IDBS, p. 986, sec. 3.

[36] Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, trans. S. H. Hooke, Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1958, pp. 55-73.

In the letter to the church in Thyatira, we have an instructive definition of the works required in Revelation (2:19):

> I know your works, your love and faith and service and patient endurance...

These works, moreover, are designated not the works of the Mosaic Law, but the works of Christ (2:26). Yet, two other passages contain language which clearly reflects the Mosaic commandments (12:17; 14:12). In Revelation, the principle of works prescribed in the Mosaic Law is interpreted in light of the prophet who was like but greater than Moses (Deuteronomy 18:18; Acts 3:22; John 1:24; Revelation 15:3). At any rate, the conditionality of the enjoyment of the blessing in the land in the Mosaic tradition is a principle which prevails in Revelation: the victorious saints who enjoy the promise of blessing and salvation are those who endure in both faith and works (14:12, 20:12, 22:12). Although the true Israel cannot attribute the basis of her salvation and blessing in the kingdom of Christ -- and ultimately in the kingdom of eternity -- to any merits of her own, her realization of this enjoyment depends on her behavior: the true Israel must both believe in Christ and be obedient to the commandments of God.

The second indication of the Mosaic tradition concerning the land is the reference to the song of Moses in Revelation 15:3. The occurrence of this reference in Revelation is understandable. The song of Moses expresses the jubilation of the victorious Israelites over their enemies and steadfast hope that God would lead them into and bless them in the promised land (Exodus 15:4-10, 13:17). In an allusion to the situation of historic Israel at the edge of the Reed Sea, victorious spiritual Israel stands beside the heavenly sea of glass and sings of God's victory for them over their spiritual and political enemies. They too look forward to salvation in the land in the messianic age when all nations shall come and worship God (Revelation 15:4; cf. Psalm 68:9; Isaiah 2:4; 66:23).

One final motif appears in Revelation which is connected with the concept of the land. The new earth is represented not only in terms of the capital of the promised land (Jerusalem) but also in terms of Paradise. Three reasons probably stand behind the combination of the New Jerusalem and Paradise: the association of Eden with Zion in some Old Covenant traditions; the concept of the return of Paradise in the Last Age; and the significance of the unmediated accessibility of God in the Age to Come. Before we examine these three reasons in deference to the promised land, however, a word is in order concerning the term Paradise itself.

According to Joachim Jeremias and Harvey K. McArthur, the word Paradise is probably of Persian origin, and meant a park or garden. In the Greek translation of Genesis two and three, it was used to render the Hebrew word for the garden which God planted in Eden. Both Jeremias and McArthur indicate that although there is some difference in details and language, the concept of Paradise was understood in three ways:[37] to signify the Garden of Eden and the bliss of the First Age (Genesis 2-3; Romans 3:23; 5:12; 8:20; Matthew 19:8 ff.); to signify the hidden abode of the righteous dead in the present time (1 Enoch 20:7, 70:4; Apocalypse of Moses 37:5; 2 Baruch 4:2-7; Psalms of Solomon 14:2; 4 Ezra 3:6; 2 Corinthians 12:4; Luke 16:23; 23:43); to signify the return of Paradise in the Last Age so that the Last Age will be like the First Age in perfect bliss (Isaiah 7:15; 11:6 ff.; 35; 3 Isaiah 65:20, 22; Micah 5:9 ff.; Jubilees 3:18; Testament of Levi 18:10 ff.; 1 Enoch 25:4; 4 Ezra 8:52; Revelation 2:7; 21-22).

As McArthur points out, we should not understand three different kinds of Paradise because of the concept's diverse use.[38] Indeed, Jeremias asserts that throughout these various uses of Paradise, "one and the same garden of God may be seen quite indubitably from both the terminology and the content of the relevant statements."[39] The three uses probably correspond to the historical development of the concept in Jewish theology. The Paradise in the First Age was something man lost through sin. Afterward, it became the hidden abode of the elect dead. With the emergence of the doctrine of the resurrection, the restoration of Paradise could be expected in the Age to Come.

---

[37] Joachim Jeremias, "παραδεισος" in The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 5, ed. Gerhard Friedrich and Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967, pp. 765-773 (hereafter this dictionary cited as TDNT); McArthur, "Paradise," IDB, vol. 3, pp. 655-656.

[38] McArthur, "Paradise," IDB, vol. 3, p. 656.

This understanding of the concept of Paradise is good as far as it goes. Yet, this approach of Harvey McArthur and Joachim Jeremias isolates the concept of Paradise from the vital theological perspective concerning the realities of salvation in Judaism -- enjoyment of life in the promised land. Consequently, the concept of Paradise takes on the garb of apocalyptic esotericism, and it is therefore understandable that both McArthur and Jeremias find it necessary to emphasize that what is really important in this concept is the restoration of an inseparable communion with God which was broken by Adam's sin. Yet, both Walter Brueggemann, in his study of the kerygma of P and Jon Douglas Levenson, in his examination of Ezekiel's program of restoration, show that this is the point which is brought forward, when the concept of Paradise is not isolated from that of the land. This approach helps clarify why the New Jerusalem and Paradise motifs are combined in Revelation; and throws light on the Paradise theme in both the Odes of Solomon and the Apocalypse of Peter.

EXCURSUS 1: ON PARADISE

Jon Levenson, countering the position of Walther Eichrodt, has advanced a good argument which indicates that we may look earlier than Ezekiel 47:1-12 for a time in which the traditions of Paradise, of Jerusalem as God's city, and of divine blessing on all beings were associated. The themes of the miraculous river of Paradise, blessing, and the Temple are "closely and organically associated" in Psalm 36:7-10. The cherubim associated with the guarding of Eden may be reflected in language which suggests the outstretched wings of the cherubim on the ark of God (Psalm 36:7). Levenson's fundamental proposition in this respect is that a common fund of ideas -- Paradise, the Temple, Mount

---

[39] Jeremias, "παράδεισοσ," TDNT, vol. 5, p. 768. Cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Contribution of the Book of Revelation to the Christian Belief in Immortality," Scottish Journal of Theology, 27, 1974, p. 84.

Zaphon/Zion, Jerusalem -- are used to designate the place where it is believed God is immediately accessible.[40]

In support of this position, Levenson appeals to the understanding of the sacred mountain by the patriarchs in Canaan. The position of Richard J. Clifford emphasized the different geographic origins of the Eden theme and the traditions of Mount Zaphon/Zion, and suggests that the joining of the two themes occurred late and was peculiar to Ezekiel. In his view, Clifford does not favor an interpretation which sees the river Gihon in Genesis two as representing the spring of Jerusalem.[41] Levenson, however, offers a judicious criticism of Clifford's position by pointing out that it is not so much the place of origin which is relevant to the connection of these two themes as it is the later development of the understanding of these themes once the patriarchs were in Canaan.[42] Once in Canaan, the sacred mountain of the north came to be identified with the paradisical image of the place where God dwelled and was accessible to men (cf. Ezekiel 28:11-19; 47:1-12; Zechariah 14:8, Joel 4:18).

Another connection which Jon Levenson proposes existed between Zion and Eden was the motif of trees -- i.e. the trees of Paradise which were watered by the miraculous stream.[43] Levenson points to the fact that the early Hebrew people built shrines near wells and trees as an expression of this belief (Genesis 13:18, 21:31, 26:23-25). In fact, Joshua 24:26 is a good indication that the concept of Paradise was connected with the shrine because of a tree which was inside the ancient sanctuary at Shechem. This proposition is not at all untenable, when it is recalled that a purpose of the Yahwist and the Deuteronomic history was to signify the importance of the promised land as the legitimate experience of blessing and salvation for the elect people of God (cf. Ezekiel 31:1-9;

---

[40] Levenson, Program of Restoration, p. 28.

[41] Clifford, Cosmic Mountain, pp. 98-103.

[42] Levenson, Program of Restoration, pp. 28-29.

[43] Ibid, pp. 29-31. Cf. Hugh C. White, "Divine Oath in Genesis," p. 169.

47:1-12). As we discussed in Part 1, although the emphasis of the Deuteronomic history is on the conditionality of the enjoyment of this promise because of the threat of eighth century syncretism, the emphasis of the Yahwist was concerned with this theme in deference to the Davidic empire of the tenth century. This is a point Jon Levenson makes in connection with the theme of the miraculous river connected with both the Edenic Paradise and the sacred mountain of Zaphon/Zion:

> In fact, if the scholarly consensus is correct in dating J, the earliest of the documents which make up the Pentateuch, to the Davidic/Solomonic era or soon thereafter, it is quite natural that J's original audience would have made just that connection, since the Gihon is mentioned prominently in David's time (1 Kings 1:33, 38), where it is the place of Solomon's anointing. Thus, whatever Gihon originally meant, it surely served as a conduit between two similar complexes of tradition, that of Jerusalem-Zion, whose roots lie most immediately in Late Bronze Age Canaan, and that of the Garden of Eden, whose roots lie ultimately in Mesopotamia.[44]

Many features, in fact, are common to the two traditions of Eden and Zion: the fabulous mineral wealth; the great beauty of each and fecundity; the miraculous stream; the presence of trees whose significance is greater than that of botany; and the accessibility of God. Further, the features of these traditions are not unrelated to a pattern of the Divine Warrior theme as Frank Moore Cross points out in his book, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic (cf. Exodus 15:17-18 and Psalm 29:1-9).[45] This connection, in fact, is explicit in Second Isaiah (51:3-5). The point made by the association of the motif of Paradise with the realities of Judaism as represented by Zion, Jerusalem, and the Temple is that communion with God is envisioned as once again restored.

Walter Brueggemann brings forward yet another point in respect to the concept of Paradise and its intimate association with the concept of the promised land in his discussion of the kerygma of P. Beginning in the primeval account of creation, P relates the concept of blessing in and occupation of the land promised to Abraham to the dominion given Adam in Genesis 1:28:[46]

---

[44] Levenson, Program of Restoration, p. 29.

[45] Cross, Myth and Epic, pp. 91 ff.

> And God blessed them, and God said to them,
> 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth
> and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish
> of the sea and over the birds of the air and
> over every living thing that moves upon the earth.'

Afterward, this theme of blessing and control of the land is repeated at least in part, to Noah, Jacob, Joseph, and the generation of Moses. Brueggemann suggests that the emphasis of the narrative corpus in P is on the blessing of man in the land through five assertions which were appropriate for the needs of the people of God in exile. What is commanded for Adam in reference to Paradise is what the exilic community of God's people longed for in reference to life and blessing in their homeland (Genesis 9:28): be fruitful; multiply; fill the land; subdue the land; have dominion over the land.[47] Moreover, Brueggemann maintains that P's kerygma was determined by old land-possession traditions preserved especially in the Deuteronomic material. Further, both the legal material and the genealogies are used by P to stress the care with which the restored land must be preserved and the continuity between the promise to the patriarchs and the generation of the exile. As the creation account covering man and Paradise made clear, man was intended to be blessed in his land. This, therefore, is the promise which God made to the people of his election, and the means whereby the nations of the world would be blessed:

> In Genesis 1, P is not concerned with abstract affirmations about cosmic origins but about regaining the land. Thus the idea of creation is simply a vehicle for the promise and expectation of a new conquest, renewed blessing, because Yahweh continues to be faithful and powerful...[48]
>
> The promise is not an event that happened along the way and became obsolete as historical events moves

---

[46] Brueggemann and Wolff, O.T. Traditions, p. 103.

[47] Ibid., pp. 104-109. Cf. J. J. Thiery, "The Logos as Teacher in Ad Diognetum XI, 1," Vigiliae Christiannae, 20, 1966, p. 149.

[48] Brueggemann and Wolff, O. T. Traditions, p. 110.

> along. Rather it is rooted in the deepest reality -- the declaration of God at creation -- so that it cannot be voided by any historical eventuality, even by the exile. From all eternity God has ordained the land as blessing, and P bears witness to that hope.[49]

As P gave a more ancient anchorage to the Davidic promises in the Abrahamic traditions, P gave a secure anchorage to the concept of the promised land in the primeval account of creation and the First Age. It is in the land prepared for man, whether Paradise or Canaan, that mankind was meant to enjoy salvation and blessing. In this condiiton, mankind was to enjoy the immediate accessibility of communion with God -- whether it was through the mysterious presence of God in the Shekinah or through the unmediated presence of God as depicted in Paradise. This is the theme Revelation affirms in respect to the promised land.

PAPIAS

Papias, was a bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, who flourished in the first half of the second century. In the words of James A. Kleist, Papias "is in many respects an interesting, if not irritating, figure in early Church history."[50] This is because of both the ambiguity and scantiness of the data concerning Papias and his writings, fragments of which survive in Irenaeus, Eusebius, and later Christian writers.

Irenaeus described Papias as a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. (Against Heresies v. 33.4). Irenaeus meant the Apostle John in this passage. Eusebius, however, considered that Papias distinguished between two Johns, the apostle and the elder. Further, Eusebius believed that Papias was a pupil of the elder (Ecclesiastical History iii.39). This understanding, in fact, may be supported by an epitome of Papias' work preserved by Philip of Side in which it is related that Papias in his second treatise claimed that both brothers James and John were slain by the Jews. Yet, even this testimony is not without its difficulties. In the same context, Philip of Side also reiterates Irenaeus' assertion that Papias "was a hearer of John the theologian and companion of Polycarp."[51] This, perhaps, is an indication John the Apostle is to be understood. There is, however, no information offered concerning the date of the slaying of John, and it is not altogether improbable that the brothers James and John in this passage are confused with James the Just and John the Baptist. Moreover, if Papias and Polycarp were companions, there is practically no indication they shared the same theological emphasis:

---

[49] Ibid., pp. 112-113.

[50] James A. Kleist, The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistle and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus, Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 6, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1948, p. 105 (hereafter cited as ACW, vol. 6).

> Polycarp speaks like the Pastorals, whereas Papias ignores Paul, seeks out the sayings of the Lord, reflects on the fulfillment of Old Testament promises, shows contact with Rabbinic exegesis, and sets all within the framework of a vigorous chiliasm.[52]

The point of Walter Bauer in Orthodoxy and Heresy may be applicable in this respect. Because of the problem of the distorted appreciation of Paul by Marcion and other Gnostics, Papias was reluctant to use Paul or emphasize Paul's theological perspectives.[53] This point, however, loses some force in light of the writings of Second Peter, the Pastorals, the Fourth Gospel and Letters of John, and the Letters of Ignatius. It is more probable that if, as tradition has it, Papias and Polycarp were companions, they were inclined to quite different although orthodox theological bents. Certainly, there is no reason to assume, as does William R. Scheodel, that a lack of similarity in theological emphasis or position, indicates the extent of time -- i.e. a brief time -- they were companions.[54]

---

[51] Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, pp. 117-118.

[52] William R. Schoedel, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, p. 90.

[53] Walter Bauer, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, 2d ed., trans. a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971, p. 215 (hereafter cited as Orthodoxy and Heresy).

[54] Schoedel, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, p. 90.

The Patrologie of Berthold Altaner-Alfred Stuiber places the time of Papias' writings around 130 A.D., which is the suggestion of Johannes Quasten.[55] This, however, is only a guess, and no reasons are offered that support this conclusion with any conviction. More probable, is the conclusion of William Schoedel. Although Schoedel argues that it is conceivable Papias wrote before the time of composition of either Luke or the Fourth Gospel, he decides against the possibility that Papias had direct contact with the Apostle John, and was only in direct communication with the elders who were in contact with the apostles. A date around 110 A.D., would therefore, seem probable. Schoedel supports this position by the fact that Papias can largely ignore the threat of Gnosticism and that Eusebius possibly might have been inclined to date Papias as late as possible because of his views on the millennium.[56] Even if the date of Papias' writings were somewhat later, the point made by Jean Daniélou is most probable and important to keep in mind: Papias records older traditions going back to Apostolic times.[57]

Concerning the purpose of Papias' writings, the main thrust of the thesis of Walter Bauer is tantalizing, although it does not require the extreme conclusions of Bauer in respect to the gospels of Luke, John, and the Letters of Paul: Papias, aware of the threat of certain strong heretical currents in Asia Minor sought to put forward the authentic teaching of the apostles as preserved by orthodox elders who had known the apostles. This might explain why Papias did not limit himself to the essential doctrines of the Church, but also advanced his understanding of such concepts as the millennial kingdom and the believers ultimate destiny of salvation -- subjects which received significantly different interpretations and exegesis in some of the theologies of Gnostic and Jewish-Gnostic teachers.

---

[55] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 52; Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 82.

[56] Schoedel, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, pp. 89-92. This would seem to be closer to the view of Kleist, Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. 6, p. 105, n. 1.

[57] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, p. 46.

Papias was certainly interested in obtaining the genuine traditions and teachings of the Apostles and the elders who knew them. The information he records is asserted to represent the traditional teachings of his own time, and on the basis of this very assertion he merited the attention of Irenaeus through whom he exerted a significant influence in the later Church, particularly in respect to the traditions of the elders, of which some have remained quite problematic to the present.[58] Several traditions in the Fragments are of direct concern for our subject.

The text in Fragment I, which may have been shaped somewhat by Irenaeus' theory of recapitulation, is a tradition dependent on Jewish apocalyptic and traced by Irenaeus to the elders of Asia Minor who had received it from John, the disciple of the Lord (*Against Heresies*, v. 33. 3-4).[59] The theme of the text is the *creatura renovata et liberata*, and the language is reminiscent of the kind of allegory found in the rabbinic sources such as a midrash on Genesis 27:28. That the language was meant to be taken literally, however, is clearly indicated in the context, and the σωματικῶs of Eusebius in his criticism of Papias' literalism make any allegorical interpretation of this passage improbable.[60] That Papias at times employed allegory, however, is a distinct probability. Evidence for this may be seen in Fragments VI and VII, in which there is the indication that Papias' exegesis of the six days of creation may have referred this allegorically to Christ and the Church.[61] Further, if Papias at times employed allegory as a valid system of exegesis, his understanding of the future blessedness of creation in literal terms augments the possibility that it was not his speculative theology or inability to understand mythical language, but rather this faithfulness to the tradition as orally transmitted to him.

---

[58] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "Papias," *IDB*, vol. 3, p. 648.

[59] See note 8, Chapter 1, Part 3 for translation and edition of Irenaeus.

[60] Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, 2 vols., London and New York: William Heinemann and G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926, p. 294 (iii. 39.12).

[61] *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, pp. 114-116; cf. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 376-379.

Two passages that closely parallel the apocalyptic element of renewal in Fragment I are 2 Baruch 29:5 and 1 Enoch 10:19. Of the two, the Baruch passage is the more similar, especially in the progression of the material: Fragment I -- vineyards, ten thousand vines, branches, shoots, clusters, grapes, twenty-five measures of wine; 2 Baruch 29:5 earth, ten thousand branches, clusters, grapes, cor of wine. Further, the context of both the 1 Enoch and the 2 Baruch passages is the time of the messianic age. Whether or not this was the original context of Fragment I cannot be ascertained with absolute certainty. If it were -- and there is no reason in Irenaeus' schemata to disallow this -- the wonderful fruitfulness of the earth would represent the "in-breaking" of the Age to Come in the dramatic imagery of Paradise (cf. Isaiah 11:6-9; 65:25; Amos 9:13).

As we pointed out in our study of the Paradise motif in Excursus 1, the bliss and fruitfulness of Paradise was a theme associated with renewed blessing in the promised land (cf. Ezekiel 28; 31; 47:1-12). The bliss which mankind lost in the curse on Adam would begin to be restored through the promise of blessing in the land to Abraham. If this is the significance, the land -promise theme in deference to its territorial aspect would certainly be assumed in the enjoyment of and blessing in the messianic kingdom. That this is the significance of Fragment I is further supported by Fragment II.

In Fragment II, the tradition of the messianic reign of Christ and the saints is presented in terms of the apocalyptic elements of the resurrection of the dead and the millenium.[62] The summary of the tradition passed on by Papias is given in Eusebius as follows (Ecclesiastical History iii.39.12):

> Among them he mentions a certain period of a thousand years after the resurrection from the dead when Christ's Kingdom will be established physically upon

---

[62] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse, Ecumenical Studies in Worship, 6, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960, p. 81 (hereafter cited as Paschal Liturgy and Apocalypse).

> this earth (σωματικῶς τῆς χριστοῦ βασίλειας
> ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆσ ὑποστησομένης).

The striking similarity between this passage and Revelation 20:4 is obvious. It also corresponds rather well with the apocalyptic schemata outlined in the section designated the "Testament of Hezekiah" in the apocalyptic book of the Ascension of Isaiah (4:14-18). Although Jean Daniélou probably reads too much into this latter passage, when he suggests that it supports the concept of extraordinary fecundity during the messianic age, his understanding of the passage as clearly indicating a temporary messianic age, is certainly justified.[63] The concept of the promised land is both assumed in the temporal messianic kingdom, and reflects the tradition of the promises concerning the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. There remains, however, a question concerning the relationship between the messianic age and the Age to Come in the teaching of Papias.

William Schoedel has recently put forward the thesis of Friedrich Loofs regarding the apocalyptic schemata of Papias and the elders represented in Irenaeus' Against Heresies. Loofs argued that the section in Against Heresies v. 31-36, "zeigt sich in dem allen deutlich, dass zwei verschiedene Auffassungen des 'regnum filii' und der ihm folgenden Ewigkeitsvollendung hier durcheinander gehen."[64] He identified one position as that of the tradition of the elders mediated through Papias. Loofs understood this tradition as teaching that the millennium, which represents the fulfillment of the promised land to Abraham, would blossom like Paradise and would endure forever:

> die erneuerte Erde ist von ewiger Dauer, und für diejenigen unter den der Teilnahme am Millennium wurdig Befundenen, die hundertfältig Frucht getragen haben, beginnt das Aufgenommerwerden in den Himmel schon gleich nach der (ersten) Auferstehung [Against Heresies v. 36, 1 ff.; cf. Fragments of the Elders, III, IV, V, VI].[65]

---

[63] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 378 ff.

[64] Friedrich Loofs, Theophilus von Antioch Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus, TU, 46:2, Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930, p. 335 (hereafter cited as Theophilus von Antioch).

[65] Ibid., p. 336.

The second position he identified as the one represented in Revelation, in which the New Age clearly follows a temporary messianic kingdom (Against Heresies, v. 35.2). Further, these two different traditions, according to Loofs, were brought into harmony by Irenaeus as is evident in v. 35.2 in respect to Jerusalem. Loofs believed that the rebuilding of Jerusalem according to the heavenly pattern during the kingdom reflects Irenaeus' effort to blend these two opposing traditions together.

> Die Vorstellung, dass erst nach den Ereignissen von Apok. 20, 11-21, 4 das himmlische Jerusalem herabkommen werde, ist völlig im Einklange mit der Apokalypse (21, 10); aber im Zusammenhange des Irenaeus-Textes ist diese nova superior Hierusalem eine Dublette neben der Hierusalem reaedificata a Christo der ersteren Gedankenreihe.[66]

William Schoedel offers an interpretation of Fragments V and VI in the "Tradition of the Elders" which supports Loofs' thesis. In Fragment V, the elect inhabit the city, Paradise or heaven according to the fruitfulness of their works. Fragment VI indicates that the saved advance in steps "Through the Spirit to the Son, through the Son to the Father, the Son finally yielding his task to the Father." Schoedel understands that these fragments support the idea that the renewed earth continues "for all time for those unworthy of Paradise or heaven and incapable of further progressing toward them."[67] This interpretation, however, is not warranted by the context of these traditions in Against Heresies v. 36.1-2 .[68]

Throughout the section in Against Heresies v. 31-36, Irenaeus distinguishes between the inaugural messianic kingdom of temporary duration and the Age to Come. Further, from v. 35.1-v.36.3, the idea is clearly presented that the elect do wax stronger in righteousness -- they grow in the Lord, as it were -- during the temporary kingdom as a preparation for the glory of the New Age. In Fragment VI the idea of advancing in steps need not carry with it the concept of progress. "Through the Spirit" probably signifies the Church Age, "through the Son," the Age of the messianic kingdom, and the goal of "the Father," the Age to Come. This is probably the way Irenaeus understood the saying, for he compares it to First Corinthians 15:25. The stages of preparation for Eternity clearly do not go beyond the temporal messianic kingdom (Against Heresies v. 35.1-36.1).

---

[66] Ibid., p. 337.

[67] Schoedel, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 5, pp. 126-127.

[68] Cf. A. Skevington Wood, "The Eschatology of Irenaeus," Evangelical Quarterly, 41, 1969, p. 32.ff.

There is nothing to indicate that the teaching regarding the ultimate destiny in the city, Paradise, or heaven of various saved individuals was not simply an attempt to explain traditions such as are found in Matthew 5:19, 13:8, John 14:2, and Revelation 20:12. In Revelation, the promise of different places of salvation are envisioned for different groups: the city of the New Jerusalem for the church in Ephesus (2:7); Paradise for the church in Philadelphia (3:12); heaven for the one hundred and forty-four thousand (14:3) and those who conquered the beast (15:2; cf. 5:6). What would the conclusion be if we did not have the last three chapters of Revelation to see how these different destinies harmonize in the messianic age and the Age to Come? The schemata into which Irenaeus worked the traditions of the Asiatic elders and Papias probably did not differ in any significant degree from that originally conceived. If one considers the various promises in Revelation 2-3 with the fulfillment of these promises in Revelation 20-22, the conception of the messianic age and the Age to Come is no less "confused" than that presented in Against Heresies or the isolated fragments. Indeed, R. H. Charles thought that the presentation of the Jerusalem-New Jerusalem motif in Revelation 20-22 every bit as confused as Friedrich Loofs did of the same motif in Against Heresies v. 35.2[69]

It would seem that both Loofs and Schoedel have failed to consider the significance of the Paradise motif as expressed in Ezekiel 28; 31; 47:1-12; Isaiah 11:6-9 and Amos 9:13 in connection with the promised land and the messianic age. These apocalyptic motifs did not follow any uniform and rigid sequence so that, for example, the unusual fecundity of the land was envisioned as taking place only in the New Age. To argue that it did would be to impose a gridiron on these themes and images and thus create an artificial schemata similar to rigid fundamental Dispensationalism.

---

[69] Charles, Revelation of St. John, vol. 1, pp. l-lviii; vol. 2, pp. 180 ff.

For Papias, what was important was the quality of the source of a tradition. He recognized that some traditions current in his time were not apostolic or even quasi-apostolic. He was a gatherer of facts. To this point, A. F. Walls writes: "For him, authenticity meant apostolicity: and apostolicity was patient historical verification. Far from being uninterested in the literary preservation of the tradition, he is wrestling manfully with the problems involved in it."[70] Indeed, Papias had a test for the source of his traditions, and that test was the living voice of the hearers of the elders who could relate what the apostles taught. Because of this very method, Papias appealed to the Church around him, in Asia Minor, and preserved for us the tradition of the land-promise theme as understood by some there at the time.

BARNABAS

Pseudo-Barnabas is a treatise, dogmatic and didactic, containing the ethical instruction of the two ways material, demonstrating "Judaism as the great deception" concerning the will and the way of God. Though it has been maintained that the treatise was written for baptismal instruction by L. W. Barnard and Walter Eltester,[71] Robert Kraft has argued that the primary thrust of the work is paraenetic, and is charged with the atmosphere of gnosis, in its legitimate sense, and eschatology.[72] The treatise, like the Didache, draws upon many sources and is sometimes seen as a school product of traditional blocks which Pseudo-Barnabas as author-editor has compiled in order to emphasize the things important for salvation.[73]

---

[70] A. F. Walls, "Papias and Oral Tradition," Vigiliae Christianae, 21, 1967, p. 139.

[71] L. W. Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers, pp. 80-85; Walter Eltester, "Barnabas, epistle of," IDB, vol. 1, pp. 357-358.

[72] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, pp. 24-29, 99.

[73] Ibid., pp. 19-21.

Although the provenance of Barnabas is not at all certain, most scholars have decided in favor of Alexandria. Two principal reasons are advanced in support of this. The first is the early use of Barnabas by Clement of Alexandria and its place among the books of the New Testament in the Codex Sinaiticus.[74] The second is the conviction that, as Bishop Lightfoot put it, the style and method of interpretation in Barnabas is essentially Alexandrian.[75] These reasons, however, are not without their difficulties.

It may be probable that even if Clement had never read Barnabas, he would have given evidence of the same kind of "ethical gnostic-Jewish" theology. It is not at all certain as Kraft has judiciously cautioned that Clement derived this approach from Alexandrian circles.[76] It remains an open question therefore whether or not the approach of Barnabas is to be peculiarly associated with an Alexandrian school typified in Clement. Klaus Wengst asserted that Egyptian Christianity was quite capable of absorbing this kind of Barnabian perspective in the fifty years between its composition and first known attestation by Clement.[77] The "Alexandrian" method of interpretation in Barnabas is meant to indicate that the allegory in Barnabas is the same kind as that found in Philo and his predecessors in Alexandria. With the implication that this kind of allegory was largely confined to Alexandria, it is maintained that Barnabas probably originated there. Jean Audet, however, has questioned the soundness of this assumption:

---

[74] Robert Grant, "The Apostolic Fathers First Thousand Years," Church History, 31, 1962, p. 423. Origen called it a general epistle (Contra Celsum 1:63).

[75] J. B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers, completed by and ed. J. R. Harmer, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974, p. 134.

[76] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, pp. 46-47.

[77] Klaus Wengst, Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. 42, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971, p. 113 (hereafter cited as Theologie des Barnabasbriefes).

> Alexandria as a place of origin is no more than a learned guess, based on the questionable idea that everything allegorical in scriptural interpretation betrays some connection with the great intellectual metropolis of Egypt.[78]

Other scholars have advanced the proposition that the allegory in Barnabas is not Philonic, but Palestinian in character. This is the conclusion of Louis Ginsberg, Pierre Prigent and Wengst.[79] Moreover, much of the material in Barnabas that Kraft considered Alexandrian in respect to its allegorical interpretation (2-3; 9-10; 12-13; possibly 6:8-19; 11:8-11; 16:6-10), Prigent offered as good examples of the Jewish midrasch one would find in Syria (6:8-19; 7-8; 10-12).[80]

Another point may be made concerning Barnabas and its Alexandrian affinities: In an effort to show a relationship between Stephen's theology as depicted in Acts and Alexandrian Christianity in the second century, Barnard notes several points of similarity between Stephen's speech and Barnabas. Barnard concludes that both the speech and the epistle maintain essentially the same position in respect to the Temple, Moses, the Torah, the Jews, sacrificial worship and Christ as the "Righteous One."[81] It is interesting that although Barnard categorically assumes Barnabas is Alexandrian, he cannot find any reason to support the thesis that the followers of Stephen came to Alexandria and provided the basis for Barnabas' use of Stephen's theology. He concludes "on the side of caution" that "the Alexandrian writer of Barnabas took over and adapted Stephen's theology directly from the Book of Acts."[82]

---

[78] Jean-Paul Audet, "Barnabas," NCE, vol. 2, p. 103.

[79] Ginsberg, "Allegorical Interpretation," The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer, reprint of 1901 ed., New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1964, p. 410; Prigent, Épître de Barnabé, Sources Chrétiennes, no. 172, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, pp. 11-12; Wengst, Theologie des Barnabasbriefes, pp. 113-114.

[80] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, p. 48; Prigent, Épître de Barnabé, p. 12.

[81] Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers, pp. 63-69. But note the reference to the "Righteous One" in James 5:6.

[82] Ibid., p. 72.

Humility is recommended in any discussion of hellenistic Judaism. It must be remembered that one's theological bent was not certainly determined by geographical location. Paul was a member of the Diaspora. One would hardly describe him as a hellenist. It is not necessary to assume that Stephen had Alexandrian connections because of his "liberal" views -- certainly not on the basis of Luke's reconstructed speech in Acts 7.

This raises an interesting possibility. If we do not assume that the author-editor of Barnabas was Alexandrian, as does Barnard, certain stereotyped, hellenistic biases in Barnabas which are generally associated with the liberal-allegorical exegetes of Alexandria, may have been the result of the author adopting the theological perspective of Stephen as depicted in Acts 7. This would not require a literary dependency on Acts, but rather the adoption of the kind of theological tradition or perspective represented in Acts 7. Further, we would not need to look to the horizons of Alexandrian theology for this theological position. In contrast to the persuasion of Barnard, it is simply impossible to determine the historical value or theological tradition Stephen's speech represents. It is not at all probable that Stephen's speech indicates in any way an Alexandrian origin for Barnabas. If anything, the speech is evidence of quite the contrary: this so-called "Alexandrian" perspective was a significant position of Christians outside Alexandria.

A more objective evaluation is offered by James Kleist. Although he considers Alexandria plausible on the basis (again) of the allegorical method in Barnabas, he is not at all persuaded Barnabas really belongs there:

> We do not know who the author of the Epistle of Barnabas is, or when and where he wrote, or to what specific group of Christian readers he addressed his words of warning. Nor is the meaning of some allusion to his time beyond all doubt. One thing is certain: it is only from this epistle that we learn the interesting fact that between the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 and the second catastrophe of Hadrian's time, Judaism...raised its head so high as to become a grave danger to a certain Christian community.[83]

---

[83] Kleist, ACW, vol. 6, p. 29.

This is in substance the conclusion of Wengst, who considers the hitherto advanced debate concerning Barnabas' place of origin to end with a "non liquet."[84]

Wengst makes note of the same serious threat of "Judaism" to the community addressed in Barnabas. He suggests a similarity with the "Jewish" problem Ignatius combatted in the church in Philadelphia, and points out that certain differences between the two situations may represent some twenty years of change between the problem Ignatius faced and that faced by the author-editor of Barnabas.[85] This is a tantalizing proposition. As we pointed out in our discussion of Revelation, the Johannine literature, the Pastorals, and the writings of Bishop Ignatius show evidence that a certain kind of "Jewish" heresy threatened the Asian churches.[86] That some form of Jewish theology was still a threat in the same area near the end of the second century is quite probable in light of the Acts of Paul.

If an original historical debate between Justin and Trypho (Rabbi Tarphon?) occurred in Ephesus around A.D. 132-135, we would have further indication that the problem of Judaism and Christianity was a live issue in Asia during the time in which it is likely the final form and content of Barnabas was fixed. Although there is no reason to indicate a literary dependence, there are affinities between Barnabas and Justin in the use of some traditional material and an exegesis involving a legitimate use of gnosis as Kraft has pointed out.[87] Questions involving the proper understanding of the Mosaic Law, Cristology, the Church as the true Israel, and the Old Covenant promises in respect to the

---

[84] Wengst, Theologie des Barnabasbriefes, p. 114.

[85] Ibid., pp. 114-118.

[86] Cf. D. Moody Smith, Jr., "Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on its Character and Delineation," New Testament Studies, 21, 1975, pp. 229, 233-234, 248.

[87] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, p. 50.

Church are significant issues in both Barnabas and the Dialogue with Trypho.

Another reason may indicate Asia as the place where the various sources and blocks of traditions of Barnabas were finally edited and published. As Kraft has pointed out, one of the pervasive themes in Barnabas "which cannot be ignored if Barnabas is to be understood" is eschatology.[88] The eschatology and apocalyptic hopes in Barnabas, moreover, are close to a type associated with Asia as represented in the following writings: Revelation, Papias, Justin's Dialogue, and Irenaeus' Against Heresies. This is most evident in Barnabas' affirmation of the millennium as an apocalyptic hope of the Church (Barnabas 15).

Daniélou, who seems to have assumed that Barnabas was an Alexandrian document, sought to differentiate between "the archaic doctrine of the earthly reign of Christ" in Barnabas from that of the Asiatic circles. He advanced two reasons for this: The material is lacking in Barnabas; the concept of the cosmic week is closer to the position of some Jewish Christians in Egypt.[89] These reasons, however, are not compelling. The idea of material fecundity associated with Eden and the promised land -- though sometimes given more than a literal significance in Barnabas (6:17) -- nevertheless, has in Barnabas an apocalyptic fulfillment reminiscent of the Edenic bliss we discussed in our excursus on Paradise (6:13-19). This is a point recognized by Kraft.[90] Finally, it is not at all clear that the cosmic week in Barnabas is significantly different from this teaching represented to some extent in Revelation 20:4, Fragment VI of Papias, or Against Heresies v. 28.3.[91] That the concept of the cosmic week was held in both Egypt and Asia -- as well as Syria and Palestine -- is not at all inconceivable. Indeed, it is largely because of the kind of apocalyptic views expressed in Barnabas that Kraft reached the following conclusion:

---

[88] Ibid., p. 27.

[89] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 396-400.

[90] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, p. 98.

[91] Cf. Shepherd, Paschal Liturgy and Apocalypse, pp. 80-81.

> If we must look outside of Alexandria to explain certain other features such as the apocalyptic-eschatological atmosphere, and it is not at all certain that we must, Palestine and Asia Minor seem to be the leading contenders.[92]

It seems probable that the eschatological-apocalyptic elements in Barnabas derive from Palestinian and Asia Minor traditions.

Barnabas is permeated with the atmosphere of apocalyptic, and the land-promise theme and its realization in the future runs throughout the treatise. The first element that concerns our subject is that of the concept of inheritance. The context clearly provides an apocalyptic significance for this concept. Christians are said to be living in the last days of the present evil age with the great final scandal at hand (4:4; 15:4 ff.; 16:5).

> The great final scandal is at hand, concerning which it has been written -- as Enoch says. For the Master cut short the times and the days, for this reason that his Beloved One might hasten and come into his inheritance (4:3).

As we pointed out in our discussion of First Peter, the concept of inheritance could have an apocalyptic significance that was altogether other-worldly and emptied of any connotation involving the promised land. A striking example of this is the Freer Logion of Mark 14:

> ...But other fearful things draw near also for those for whom I, because they have sinned, was delivered to death, that they might turn back to the truth and sin no more in order to inherit the spiritual and imperishable glory of righteousness preserved in heaven (ms. W).

This, however, is not the case in Barnabas.

It is true that the concept of the promised land is used allegorically to signify man -- first as man suffering (Adam) and next as man redeemed (6:8-14). This is not the only use of the promised land however. The "promised land" also signifies the apocalyptic hope of inheriting the land originally promised to the patriarchs. As Kraft has pointed out, although the argument of 6:8-19 is subtle and at times difficult, the force "is eschatological...as the 'old' creation was to have lordship over Eden, so the 'new' will ultimately rule."[93]

---

[92] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, p. 54.

The concept of inheritance is combined with that of the land. Christians as the true recipients of the promise to the fathers must walk circumspectly in their preparation for the good land which is part of the Christian's "inheritance" (4:3; 5:7; 6:8-19).[94] Indeed, the Christians will only exercise lordship over the promised land when they have been perfected as heirs of the Lord's covenant (6:17-19):

> What, then, is the 'milk and honey?' Because the infant is initiated into life first by honey, then by milk. Thus also, in a similar way, when we have been initiated into life by faith in the promise and by the word, we will live exercising lordship over the land. But as it was already said above: 'And they shall increase, and multiply, and rule over the fish...Who, then is presently able to rule over beasts or fish or birds of heaven? For we ought to understand that 'to rule' implies that one is in control, so that he who gives the orders exercises dominion. If, then, this is not the present situation, he has told us when it will be -- when we ourselves have been perfected as heirs of the Lord's covenant.

Pseudo-Barnabas introduces another apocalyptic element that provides a means whereby the land-promise theme can be actualized. This is the millennial kingdom. After the consummation of the six days (six thousand years) of this present evil age, the seventh day of a thousand years will occur.[95] This will bring an end to the Lawless One and evil (15:4-5):

---

[93] Ibid., p. 98.

[94] Cf. John R. Willis, A History of Christian Thought (From Apostolic Times to Saint Augustine), Hicksville: Exposition Press, 1976, pp. 75-76 (hereafter cited as History of Christian Thought).

[95] Lukyn Williams believed that Barnabas did not contain the concept of the millennium except in a spiritual sense. Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho, London, New York, and Toronto: SPCK and the Macmillan Company, 1930, p. 173, n. 4 (hereafter cited as Dialogue with Trypho). For an interpretation that definitely perceives a millennium in Barnabas see Hans Bietenhard, "The Millennial Hope in the Early Church," Scottish Journal of Theology, 6, 1953, pp. 12-13.

> Pay attention, children, to what he says: 'He finished in six days...' He is saying this, that in six thousand years the Lord will finish everything. For with him the 'day' signifies a thousand years. And he bears me witness saying: Behold, a day of the Lord shall be as a thousand years. Therefore, children, 'in six days' -- in six thousand years -- 'everything' will be 'finished.' 'And he rested on the seventh day.' He is saying this: When his Son comes he will put an end to the time of the Lawless One, and judge the impious, and change the sun and moon and stars -- then he will truly rest 'on the seventh day.'

Christians will at last be able to receive the promise and exercise lordship -- unlike the present situation (6:17-19) -- for they will have been made holy (15:7):

> But if he keeps it holy at that time by truly resting, when we ourselves are able to do so since we have been made righteous and have received the promise -- when lawlessness is no more and all things have been made new by the Lord -- at that time we will be able to keep it holy, when we ourselves first have been made holy!

After the sabbath rest in the messianic age, the eighth day of the New Age begins (15:8). This is in substance the schemata of Revelation 20-22.

It is evident that the tradition concerning the messianic age as an introduction to the New Age is present in Barnabas. Further, the land-promise theme with its territorial aspect is actualized in the millennium when Christians exercise their rule with Christ. Indeed, Pseudo-Barnabas uses an argument similar to that of Paul in order to demonstrate that the Church is heir of the covenant and promises: For Christians through Christ are the true heirs of the promise to Abraham (13:1; 14:5; cf. Galatians 3:15 ff.; Romans 4:13 ff.; 8:6 ff.). The nation of Israel has been disinherited. The Church together with the patriarchs, Moses, and apparently the saints of the Old Covenant are heirs of the promised land (6:8, 13; 14:1-4). The conclusion of Johannes Munck is an appropriate summary of the position of Barnabas on this point:

> Barnabas' epistle with its interpretation of Old Testament texts emphasizes strongly that God's covenant now applies only to the Christians, no longer to the Jews, for by their worshipping of idols they have lost the covenant forever. Here we find emphasis on the Church as the true Israel, but contrary to the primitive Christian line of thought, the Jews are excluded from salvation.[96]

The immigration of large Jewish-Christian and Jewish populations from Palestine into Asia Minor during the first and first-half of the second century no doubt accounts for the survival in Asia Minor in the second century of genuine Jewish ideas indigenous to Palestine before 70 A.D. It is especially here that the primitive Jewish Christian expectations of a restored Davidic Kingdom combined with the Jewish modes of thought, formed their norm in the Apocalypse of John and the apocalyptic hope of men such as the elders of Asia, and Papias.

It may be that Pseudo-Barnabas, influenced by the Jewish-eschatological traditions which survived chiefly in Asia Minor, retained the land-promise theme for at least the following two reasons:

1) In order to preserve the integrity of the promise by God to give unconditionally to Abraham's heir the land of Canaan (5:7; 6:8; 13:1).

2) In order to provide a place for a messianic kingdom as interpreted according to the millennarian thought of Revelation 20.

Further, he developed the land-promise theme to its logical literalistic conclusion by using an argument similar to the Pauline teaching about inheritance in Romans 4 and Galatians 3. Because Christ is the true heir, and the Church, as the body of Christ and fellow-heir with him, is the true Israel, the Church would therefore inherit the promised land for the duration of the messianic age.

MONTANISM

Although the date is somewhat problematic, Montanism probably originated in the third quarter of the second century in an insignificant village (Pépuza?) in the province of Phrygia.[97] The movement stressed a strong moral ethic which emphasized sexual continence.[98] It probably advocated martyrdom as a desired goal should the believer die before the return of Christ.[99] The movement was especially distinguished by its emphasis on and practice of the charismatic gift of Christian prophecy.[100] The prophetic utterances of the Montanists may have been considered by them to be as authoritative as any other church tradition or scripture. This at least seems to be the implication of several oracles which spoke in the first person on behalf of a revelation of God (Oracles 1, 2, 3).[101] In one oracle, Montanus compared a man in prophetic ecstasy to a musical instrument which God plays upon: "Behold, man is like a lyre and I rush thereon like a plectrum"(Oracle 4).

---

[96] Johannes Munck, "Primitive Jewish Christianity and Later Jewish Christianity: Continuation or Rupture?" in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme, Marcel Simon et al., Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, pp. 88-89.

It is difficult to determine whether or not the movement was orthodox in its second century form. Daniélou maintained that it was heterodox.[102] The evidence for this, however, is largely due to the judgment of polemical writers after a clear breach between Montanism and mainstream Christianity occurred. Hans von Campenhausen has pointed out that in questions of dogma, neither Hippolytus nor Epiphanius found any significant difference between Montanism and catholic Christianity.[103] Nevertheless, early the movement was considered questionable and guilty of false prophesy (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, v. 16.4, 18.2, 19.2).

---

[97] Those who favor the earlier date of Epiphanius (156-157) in *Heresies* 48.1 are: Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, p. 686, n. 1; G.S.P. Freeman-Grenville, "The Date of the Outbreak of Montanism," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5, 1954, pp. 14-15; Cross-Livingstone, *ODCC*, p. 934. Those who favor a later date are the following: J. Massingberd Ford, "Was Montainism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 17, 1956, p. 145; Timothy D. Barnes, "The Chronology of Montanism," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 21, 1970, p. 406; Altaner-Stuiber, *Patrologie*, p. 107.

[98] Gerhard Friedrich, "προφήτης," *TDNT*, vol. 6, 1968, p. 861.

[99] Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, p. 687, Oracle 8. All citations unless otherwise noted are from this translation.

[100] Moore, *The Parousia*, p. 217.

[101] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Finality of Jesus Christ in An Age of Universal History: A Dilema of the Third Century*, Ecumenical Studies in History, no. 3, London: Lutterworth Press, 1965, p. 39.

[102] Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, p. 389; cf. Ford, "Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?," pp. 146-158; John de Soyres, *Montanism and the Primitive Church: A Study in the Ecclesiastical History of the Second Century*, reprint of 1878 ed., Lexington: The American Theological Library Association, 1965, p. 77.

It is doubtful but not impossible that the early Montanists of the second century produced any writings of their own. One reason for this was the expectation of the imminent return of Christ: "After me, says she [Maximilla], there will be no more prophets, but (only) the consummation"(Oracle 12). This point should not be pressed, however, for there was ample Christian literature by that time, some of which, such as Revelation, was written down in spite of the sure conviction of the imminent return of Christ. Whether or not there were writings of early Montanism, none is extant. There are, however, fifteen oracles which are considered to correspond substantially to the original utterances of the second century Montanists.[104] What is important for this study is the apocalyptic perspective these oracles reflect in deference to the concept of the promised land.

Three oracles (11, 12, 14) offer evidence concerning the concept of the promised land. On the whole, it is probable that the concept of the land in terms of the Davidic and Zionic tradition was affirmed as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. Oracle 14, an utterance of Maximilla, shows a significant concern with a certain "covenant" and "promise:"

> The Lord has sent me as adherent, preacher and interpreter of this affliction and this covenant and this promise; he has compelled me, willingly or unwillingly, to learn the knowledge of God.
> (Epiphanius, Heresies 48.12.1)

This oracle by itself does not identify the covenant or the promise in terms of the land. As we discussed in Part 2, neither term need indicate the concept of the land in respect to its territorial aspect when used in Christian writings of the second century. Yet, it is possible that this saying is to be understood in light of Oracle 11.

---

[103] Hans von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries, trans. John A. Baker, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969, p. 188 (hereafter cited as Ecclesiastical Authority).

[104] Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, pp. 685-686.

Oracle 11 clearly puts forward the promise of the saints' future enjoyment of Jerusalem in the holy place of Pepuza. The oracle which according to Epiphanius was uttered by either Quintilla or Priscilla is as follows:

> In the form of a woman, says she, arrayed in shining garments, came Christ to me and set wisdom upon me and revealed to me that this place [=Pepuza] is holy and that Jerusalem will come down hither from heaven.
> (Epiphanius, Heresies 49. 1.2-3).

According to Appollonius, two small towns in Phrygia (Pepuza and Tymion) were renamed Jerusalem by Montanus in an attempt to draw people there.[105] In view of Oracle 11 the assertion of Arthur Cushman McGiffert seems quite probable:

> Pepuza was early made, and long continued, the chief center -- the Jerusalem -- of the sect, and even gave its name to the sect in many quarters. Harnack has rightly emphasized the significance of this statement of Apollonius, and has called attention to the fact that Montanus' original idea must have been the gathering of the chosen people from all the world into one region, that they might form one fold, and freed from all the political and social relations in which they had hitherto lived might await the coming of the Lord, who would speedily descend, and set up his kingdom in this new Jerusalem. Only after this idea had been proved impracticable did Montanism adapt itself in the midst of society as it existed in the outside world.[106]

It is not inconceivable, as von Campenhausen has pointed out, that Montanism may have been dependent on Revelation for some of its distinctive features: the importance of prophecy, sexual continence, martyrdom, and the descent of Jerusalem.[107] In this respect, Daniélou points to Tertullian, himself a later convert to Montanism, as "the great source on the millenarianism of Montanus."[108] If it could be demonstrated that Montanism definitely affirmed the concept of the thousand year reign of the saints, this would augment the possibility of its dependence on Revelation and make certain the probability of the Davidic-Zionic traditions in the system's apocalypticism. One passage in the Montanistic writings of Tertullian could substantiate this.

---

[105] Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, v. 18.1.

[106] McGiffert, Church History, p. 235, n. 6.

[107] Von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority, p. 189, n. 70; cf. Arnold Ehrhardt, "Christianity before the Apostles' Creed," Harvard Theological Review, 55, 1962, p. 107.

In Against Marcion iii, 24. 1-3, Tertullian rebuffs an attack of Marcion's on a kind of millenarianism which included the hope of the restoration of the Jews to the promised land. The millenarianism Marcion attacked may have been that of Cerinthus or of some other heterodox group. It is possible that Marcion either misunderstood the kind of "Jews" to be restored to the land or that he accurately criticized this restoration-element as something quite out of place in the apocalyptic hopes of the accepted orthodox millenarians in Asia Minor. There is certainly no indication in any writings reflecting the Asian position that the unbelieving Jews would be restored to the promised land. Whatever the case, Tertullian allegorizes the restoration-element and affirms the concept of the millenium. The passage is as follows (Against Marcion iii, 24. 1-6):

> Yes, you object, but I do hope for something from him -- and this itself amounts to a proof that there are two different Christs -- I hope for the kingdom of God, with an eternal heavenly inheritance: whereas your Christ promises the Jews their former estate, after the restitution of their country, and, when life has run its course, refreshment with those beneath the earth, in Abraham's bosom. Such a very good God, if when calmed down he gives back what he took away when angry: your God, who both smites and heals, who creates evil and makes peace: a God whose mercy reaches even down to hell.
>
> Of Abraham's bosom I shall speak at the proper time. As for the restoration of Judaea, which the Jews misguided by the names of towns and territories, hope for exactly as described, it would be tedious to explain how the allegoriacal interpretation of it is spiritually applicable to Christ and the Church and to the possession and enjoyment of it...For we do

---

[108] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, p. 389.

> profess that even on earth a kingdom is promised us: but this is before we come to heaven, and in a different polity -- in fact after the resurrection, for a thousand years, in that city of God's building, Jerusalem brought down from heaven...and the word of the new prophecy which is part of our faith bears witness to this Jerusalem, telling us even that there will be a vision of the city as a sign before its actual coming.[109]

Whether or not the position represented here was that of second century Montanism is not certain. Although some scholars accept Tertullian's position in the above passage as representative of earlier Montanism, Kurt Aland recommends caution. He offers one criterion for judging Tertullian's reliability in representing the apocalyptic schemata of early Montanism: the lack of any explicit reference to the town of Pepuza in the Montanist writings of Tertullian. There is not the slightest hint that Tertullian knew anything about this city in respect to its importance for the early Montanists or its role in the final apocalyptic drama. In particular, Aland points to the passage quoted above and suggests that there is a noticeable difference between the position of Tertullian and that of early Montanism in respect to the descent of Jerusalem:

> Ja, sogar adv. Marc. III, 24, 4, wo er ausführlich das himmlische Jerusalem und das tausendjährige Reich schildert, nennt er Pepuza überhaupt nicht, sondern spricht ausdrücklich davon, dass dieses himmlische Reich in Jerusalem in Palästina herabkommen wird. Hier zeigt sich deutlich der Abstand Tertullians grundlegenden Vorstellung von der heiligen Stadt Pepuza überhaupt nichts gewusst zu haben.[110]

---

[109] Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans, 2 vols., Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972, vol. 1, pp. 245-247.

[110] Kurt Aland, Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe: Alte Kirche, Reformation und Luthertum, Pietismus und Erweckungsbewegung, Berlin: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1960, p. 123. Whether or not Tertullian's concept of the New Jerusalem is derived from Montanism or the teachings of some Jewish communities in Carthage, or some other source is unknown. Cf. J. Massingberd Ford, "St. Paul, the Philogamist (1 Cor. VII in Early Patristic Exegesis)," New Testament Studies, 11, 1965, pp. 331-332.

There is certainly no reference to a millenium in the fifteen oracles whose authenticity seems fairly secure. One oracle may indicate quite the contrary.

Oracle 12 states clearly that after the new prophecy of Maximilla only the consummation remains: "After me...there will be no more prophets, but only the consummation." Taken by itself, this oracle seems to indicate an apocalyptic schemata close to that of 2 Peter where this world is contrasted with the World to Come. The descent of Jerusalem could be understood as an event which takes place in the transhistorical kingdom in the Age to Come. Yet, the focus of Oracle 11 seems to be decidedly "earthly" -- a heavenly Jerusalem breaking into history. Was the renaming of Pepuza as Jerusalem an indication that the Montanists considered that this event had already occurred and that the earthly aspect of the promises concerning Jerusalem were already being fulfilled? The next event would then be the Age to Come.

Perhaps both views were embraced in early Montanism. Oracles 11 and 12 are not attributed to the same prophet. It must be admitted, moreover, that it is not inconceivable that Maximilla could have considered that an inaugural messianic kingdom would introduce "the consummation." Nothing is certain. Yet, the weight of the evidence inclines me to the conclusion that early Montanism affirmed in some sense the territorial aspect of the concept of the promised land as an apocalyptic hope of the elect.[111]

---

[111] Cf. Cohn, Pursuit of the Millenium, p. 25.

CHAPTER 2

SYRIA

The Didache is an example of evolved literature containing ethical teaching for the proper Christian life. It provides authoritative instructions for the correct execution of: catechetical instruction (chs. 1-6); baptism (ch. 7); fasting (ch. 8); thanksgiving at meals (chs. 9, 10); examination and treatment of apostles and prophets (chs. 11-13); and the celebration of the Eucharist and appointment of bishops and deacons (chs. 14, 15). It contains a final but incomplete chapter of an eschatological orientation exhorting the elect to be circumspect with regard to the signs of the end and the return of the Lord.

As a product of various sources and materials, reworked and rearranged by a final editor, "the relative date of the Didache, its provenance, textual history, and significance, have to date been occasion of considerable disagreement among scholars; and no solution of these problems has yet received a widely accepted consensus."[1] Hence, the date of the extant form of the document is for the most part irrelevant when various sources may come from a period as early as the third quarter of the first century. It is, however, likely that the Didache was published near the same time as the Epistle of Barnabas. Though it is probable that the provenance of the Didache as we have it is Egypt rather than Syria, early material such as the prayers in 10:4 and the problem of Propheticism in chapter eleven may have originated in Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor.[2]

For the purpose of this study, three subjects in the Didache deserve attention. The first is the thanksgiving prayers in chapters 9-10. The second is the apocalyptic chapter 16. Finally, there is one clear reference to the concept of inheriting the land.

---

[1] Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "Didache," IDB, vol. 1, p. 841.

[2] Robert Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, pp. 74-77; cf. Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 81; Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 401.

The Thanksgiving prayers contain the apocalyptic element of the final gathering together. The two passages concerned are as follows:

> Just as this loaf previously was scattered on the mountains, and when it was gathered together it became a unity, so may your Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. (9:4)
>
> Lord, remember your Church -- rescue it from all evil and perfect it in your love -- and gather it, the sanctified one, from the four winds into your kingdom which you have prepared for it. For power and glory are yours forever! (10:5)

As has already been pointed out in our discussion of 2 Clement, the apocalyptic element has many parallels in the Jewish sources. It is probable as Kraft pointed out, that the prayers are Palestinian in origin and were used originally in an Agape setting, though the setting of the Eucharist is possible.[3] With a Palestinian origin in mind, it would not be unlikely that the messianic hope echoed in 9:2, "the holy vine of David your servant,"[4] and the gathering together of the dispersed elect pointed to the Davidic tradition of the messianic kingdom with its territorial aspect. What significance these passages had in reference to the land for the final editor or the recipients of the document, however, cannot be ascertained with any certainty.

The second matter of our concern is the apocalypse of chapter sixteen. Its relationship to Matthew 24 and 25 has been variously assessed. Paul Drews argued for a direct dependence on Matthew 24 and the traditional Jewish beliefs concerning the resurrection from the dead.[5] The conclusion of George Ladd was: "The source employed by the Didachist was primarily Matthew 24."[6] B. C. Butler, moreover, concluded that Didache 16 was directly dependent on Matthew, Mark and Luke.[7] Helmut Köster, however, examining each text in question, decided that many apparent direct dependences on the Synoptics could just as convincingly be explained as mutual dependence on elements in Jewish apocalyptic material.[8] Further, R. A. Kraft has pointed out parallels between Didache 16 and the Synoptics, epistles of Paul, 2 Baruch, and the Qumran Hymns 6:17 ff.[9] Perhaps Kraft's position would be closer to that of Köster. In examining the apocalyptic chapter, it is difficult to assign too much weight with any considerable amount of confidence to any particular source. Matthew may be what is primarily behind Didache 16.

---

[3] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, pp. 166-167.

[4] Ibid., p. 168.

[5] Paul Drews, "Untersuchungen zur Didache," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, 5, 1964, pp. 72-74.

[6] George Ladd, "The Eschatology of the Didache," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 1949, p. 175. Cf. Sherman E. Johnson, "A Subsidiary Motive for the Writing of the Didache," in Munera Studiosa, ed. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. and Sherman E. Johnson, Cambridge: The Episcopal Theological School, 1946, p. 118.

There is one passage in chapter 16 which may reflect the tradition of the earthly messianic kingdom as the introduction to the New Age. In verses 6-7 the element of partial resurrection for the elect may reflect the schemata in the twentieth chapter of Revelation. This apocalyptic element has already been discussed with regard to the victorious reign in the letter of Polycarp. Inasmuch as a good deal of Jewish apocalyptic is reflected in chapter 16, it is possible, though not at all certain, that the apocalyptic schemata allowed an earthly or temporary messianic age in which the land-promise theme would be realized.

The third and final passage of the Didache contains the apocalyptic element of the land-promise theme in its essence. The passage is as follows: "But be meek, since 'the meek will inherit the land'" (3:7). This passage clearly reflects the text of Matthew 5:5. As we have already pointed out, although Davies rejects its messianic overtones in terms of the territorial aspect of the land-promise, Sherman E. Johnson understands the Matthew passage to refer to the inheritance of the promised land or the restored earth in the messianic age.[10] Walter Brueggemann has recently explained the Matthew passage in terms of the land with its territorial aspect. In opposition to the view of Davies, Brueggemann writes: "While Davies may be correct in interpreting the text as having been spiritualized away from the meaning of Psalm 37:11, that must be done only with a troubled conscience."[11] In fact, there is a good indication that the original text in the Didache understood the promise to inherit the land in the very terms of its territorial aspect.

---

[7] B. C. Butler, "The Literary Relations of Didache Ch. XVI," Journal of Theological Studies, 11, 1960, pp. 265-283. In contrast, Richard Glover believed there was "a joint borrowing from Dan. vii. 13." "The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels," New Testament Studies, 5, 1958-1959, p. 24.

[8] Helmut Köster, Synoptische Uberlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern, TU, vol. 65, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957, pp. 173-190.

[9] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, pp. 175-177.

There are two alternate readings to the text in 3:7. CO (the "Apostolic Church Order") reads, "the meek will inherit the kingdom of the heavens/God." The Doctrine, however, reads, "the meek shall inherit the holy land."[12] Both Massey Shepherd and Jean-Paul Audet have indicated the significant Jewish overtones of the reading in the Latin version.[13] On the basis of the manuscript evidence, it would be very probable that the original understanding of this passage reflected the messianic kingdom in terms of the realization of the land-promise with its territorial aspect.

THE ODES OF SOLOMON

There is a great deal of difference in opinion among scholars regarding the exact nature, date, and provenance of the Odes of Solomon. As Walter Bauer has pointed out, scholars have proposed a Jewish origin with a Christian redaction (Harnack, Spitta), a Jewish-Christian origin

---

[10] Johnson, exegesis of "The Gospel According to St. Matthew," IB, vol. 3, pp. 175-177.

[11] Brueggemann, The Land, p. 183, n. 36.

[12] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, p. 147, n. "q".

[13] Shepherd, "Didachè," IDB, vol. 1, p. 842; Jean-Paul Audet, La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres, Paris: Gabalda, 1958, pp. 320 ff. as cited in W. D. Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 361.

(Harris), a Gentile-Christian origin (Labout, Batiffol), and a Montanist origin (Conybeare) among others.[14] Bauer himself argued that the Odes of Solomon were a Gnostic hymn-book.[15] Robert Grant maintained they were "somewhat docetic" as to their Christology.[16] Most recently, James Hamilton Charlesworth, with whom the present writer is in substantial agreement, has described the Odes of Solomon as follows:

> Odes of Solomon. An early hymnbook, neither pre-Christian and Jewish nor late and Gnostic, which reflects the joyful thanksgivings of the early Jewish Christians and contains metaphorical language characteristic of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Johannine literature.[17]

There is no reason to place the date of composition of the Odes of Solomon later than the middle of the second century. If they are not originally Jewish in origin, they cannot be earlier than the resurrection of Christ. Charlesworth argues "that the most probable date is A.D. 100." This is not supported by any solid evidence however. Charlesworth's reasons are: "the Odes' joyfulness, strong Jewish nature...and primitive Christology" together with the fact that there are "impressive parallels with the sectarian scrolls" and the close "relationship with the Johannine literature."[18] This hardly fixes a date near the year A.D. 100.

A more probable date may be one between A.D. 70 and 150. Grant maintained that like the Epistle of Barnabas, the fourth Ode "is referring to the destruction of the Temple by the troops of Titus."[19] It is true that this is not evident at first glance. The language seems to suggest quite the contrary (Ode 4:1-2):

---

[14] Walter Bauer, The Odes of Solomon, in New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, pp. 809-810 (hereafter cited as Odes of Solomon).

[15] Ibid.

[16] Robert Grant, "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch," Journal of Biblical Literature, 63, 1944, pp. 363-364. Grant did not bring out this point in a later publication. Goodspeed- Grant, Early Christian Literature, pp. 84-87.

[17] Charlesworth, "Odes of Solomon," IDBS, p. 637.

[18] Ibid. Cf. Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 161.

> 1. No man can pervert Thy holy place, O my God;
> Nor can he change it, and put it in another place.
>
> 2. Because he has no power over it; for Thy
> sanctuary Thou designedst before Thou didst make
> special places.

This probably reflects the Davidic-Zionic tradition expressed in Second Chronicles 7:16. Could this assertion of Ode 4 have been written after the destruction of the Temple? Grant thought so and referred to the fact that even after the destruction, the Ebionites still considered it the house of God. Similarly, George Foot Moore pointed out "even after the destruction of the Temple, it was maintained by Eleazar ben Pedat that God's Presence (shekinah) still abode on the ruined site in accordance with his promise."[20] Contrary to the opinion of Charlesworth, that there are no references to historical events in the odes, the fourth Ode may affirm this conviction about God's "holy place" in spite of the Temple's destruction. Unlike Pseudo-Barnabas, the Odist found no need to replace the holy place of God's presence with a spiritual temple.

---

[19] Grant, "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch," p. 369; cf. Aune, Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology, p. 174.

[20] George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of Tannaim, 2 vols., Cambridge: Harvard Universtiy Press, 1927, vol. 1, p. 369. The subject of the Temple and its cultus is a difficult one. On the basis of the Temple Scroll, no longer can the Samaritans, the Hellenists and the Qumran community be grouped together in their general rejection of the Temple itself as Raymond E. Brown has done. See his article, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in John and Qumran, ed. James H. Charlesworth, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972, pp. 3, n. 8; 6, n. 29. The Temple and a restored cultus with sacrificial worship was something the Qumran community expected in a "millenarian" sense. See Yigael Yadin, "The Temple Scroll," in New Directions in Biblical Archaeology, ed. David N. Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield, Garden City: Doubleday and Company, p. 145; Milgrom, "The Temple Scroll," Biblical Archaeologist, 41, 1978, pp. 108 ff; cf. Geza Vermes, "Dead Sea Scrolls," IDBS, p. 217, sec. 9, a, iv. The Odes of Solomon may have a similar regard for the Temple as is evident in the Dead Sea Scrolls. According to Charlesworth, "perhaps the Odes were influenced by the ideas developed in the Dead Sea Scrolls." "Odes of Solomon," IDBS, p. 637, sec. 5. Charlesworth is perhaps too hasty in asserting that Qumran and the Odes of Solomon denigrated "the importance of sacrificing in the Jerusalem Temple." Charlesworth, "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon," in John and Qumran, p. 134. What can be affirmed is that they both denigrated the cultus present in their time.

The *terminus ante quem* could be determined with some probability if some of the *Odes of Solomon* were known to Bishop Ignatius (Ode 7:21 with *Ephesians* 19:3; Ode 11:6 with *Romans* 7:2; and Ode 38:8 with *Trallians* 6.2). There is no positive evidence of a literary dependency. It may be more circumspect to speak of Ignatius as exhibiting certain affinities with the *Odes of Solomon*. A date of composition after the writings of Bishop Ignatius is possible. A. F. J. Klijn maintained the *Odes of Solomon* were written about a hundred years before the *Acts of Thomas* which he assigned to the first half of the third century.[21]

The place of origin is also problematic. Both the question of the original language of the *Odes of Solomon* (Greek or Syriac) and the affinities it shares with other writings (Dead Sea Scrolls, Fourth Gospel, the letters of Bishop Ignatius) are key factors in determining their provenance. If the original language was Syriac, Edessa or Antioch might be considered probable.[22] If, as Walter Bauer and Johannes Quasten believed, the original language was almost certainly Greek, the possibility of Ephesus is enhanced.[23] The complexity of the problem and the variety of positions that are possible may be seen in Robert Grant's conclusion regarding the *Odes* and the Fourth Gospel. He conjectured that Edessa is the most appropriate place of origin, although affinities with Ephesus and Antioch make these places possible.[24]

---

[21] Klijn, "The Influence of Jewish Theology on the *Odes of Solomon* and the *Acts of Thomas*" in *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme*, Marcel Simon et al., p. 175.

[22] Charlesworth, "Odes of Solomon," *IDBS*, p. 637.

[23] Bauer, *Odes of Solomon*, p. 809; Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1, p. 161.

[24] Grant, "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch," p. 377.

The Odes of Solomon affirm the concept of the promised land as an apocalyptic hope of the elect in an unusual and difficult way. Like the Apocalypse of Peter, the Odes of Solomon does not present an apocalyptic schemata involving a messianic kingdom in which the land-promise can be realized. This presents a somewhat different situation in respect to the promised land, inasmuch as this concept is predominately associated with either this present age or a quasi-historical period introducing the Age to Come. Yet, although the schemata is unusual, it is not entirely unprecedented. It has its roots in the apocalyptic imagery of Second and Third Isaiah and Ezekiel.

In Part 1, we pointed out that the concept of the restoration of blessing in the promised land is a significant theme in Second and Third Isaiah. Through the use of cosmic and mythical imagery, the concept of blessing in the land increasingly transcended the real historical situation and edged into the horizon of the transhistorical New Age (Isaiah 54:1-17; 65:17-25). In Third Isaiah, the envisioned promised land is practically heaven on earth. The envisioned restoration of the elect's promises was incredible in contrast to the chaotic barrenness of exilic Zion. The ecstatic proclamation which burst forth from the lips of the prophetic visionary was: "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth...I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy...no more shall be heard the sound of weeping and the cry of distress (Isaiah 65:17 ff.)." Likewise, Ezekiel portrayed the restored land of promise as Paradise on earth -- Canaan would be the New Eden (Ezekiel 28:11-19; 31; 47:1-12).

This is similar to the situation in both the Odes of Solomon and the Apocalypse of Peter. In both, the motifs of Paradise and the Age to Come intersect in the context-point of the historical promises to the patriarchs and serve to provide forever a secure place of blessing for God's elect. Like Ezekiel, it is especially the Odes of Solomon which brings together several originally different but related motifs in the depiction of the land of God's salvation.

Throughout the Odes of Solomon several concepts and images which depict the future abode of the elect are closely related and in some instances practically synonymous: the holy place of God (4:1), the

Temple (6:8), Paradise (11:14-24), the paradisical river (6:8; 12:13), and the land (11:14-24; 15:10). In the Odes of Solomon, the mythical imagery of Paradise, the spiritual power of the kingdom of God, and the historical realities of the nation of Israel converge as it were in a kaleidoscope and radiate forth as a multicolored vision of salvation in the Age to Come. As we pointed out in the excursus on Paradise, in Ezekiel several motifs are closely and organically associated and are used to designate the place where it is believed God is immediately accessible. This is the case in the Odes of Solomon. The clearest and most articulate expression of this is in Ode 11.

As in Barnabas, the Edenic land is sometimes given a figurative or allegorical force to signify man (11:12). Yet, as in Barnabas, the concept of the land as an apocalyptic hope of the redeemed is a predominate theme. This is the goal of the elect (11:14-24):[25]

> 14. My eyes were enlightened,
> And my face received the dew;
>
> 15. And my breath was refreshed
> By the pleasant fragrance of the Lord.
>
> 16. And He took me to His Paradise,
> Wherein is the wealth of the Lord's pleasure.
>
> 16a. ((I beheld blooming and fruit-bearing trees,
>
> 16b. And self-grown was their crown.
>
> 16c. Their branches were sprouting
> And their fruits were shining.
>
> 16d. From an immortal land (were) their roots.
> And a river of gladness was irrigating them,
> And round about them in the land of eternal life.))
>
> 17. Then I worshipped the Lord because of His magnificence.
>
> 18. And I said, Blessed, O Lord, are they
> Who are planted in Thy land,
> And who have a place in Thy Paradise;

---

[25] The translation used for the Odes of Solomon is the annotated edition of James Hamilton Charlesworth, The Odes of Solomon, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973. "Except for the omission of the six verses between Ode 11:16 and 17, the Syriac is more trustworthy." Charlesworth, Ibid., p. 13. (( )) indicates words peculiar to the Bodmer Papyrus XI (G).

19. And who grow in the growth of thy trees,
And have passed from darkness into light.

20. Behold, all Thy labourers (are) fair,
They who work good works,
And turn from wickedness to Thy pleasantness.

21. For they turned away from themselves the bitterness
of the trees,
When they were planted in Thy land.

22. And everyone was like Thy remnant. ((Blessed are
the workers of Thy waters,)) Because (it is) an
eternal memorial for Thy faithful servants.

23. Indeed, there is much room in Thy Paradise.
And there is nothing in it which is barren,
But everything is filled with fruit.

24. Glory be to Thee, O God, the delight of Paradise
forever. Hallelujah.

In respect to this passage, Charlesworth suggested that the Odist interwove the concepts of the present and future Paradise in order to emphasize the blessedness of the abode of the elect after death (cf. Apocalypse of Moses 38:5; 40:2; IQH 8:12-20).[26]

One feature is significantly ignored in this passage. The Temple is not mentioned. Could it be that the future abode, as in Revelation, has no need of the Temple? Is it possible the Odist ultimately rejects the Temple as is the case in Third Isaiah (Isaiah 66:1) and Barnabas (16:1 ff.)? Although there is reason to believe a rejection of the Temple is unlikely, it is difficult to determine with any conviction the apocalyptic destiny of the Temple *per se*.

As we pointed out above, Ode 4:1 probably affirms the belief that in spite of the Temple's destruction, God's presence would remain in some sense in the holy place because of the Davidic-Zionic promise reflected in 2 Chronicles 7:16. There is in Ode 4:1 ff. no explicit acceptance of or rejection of the Temple as such. The exact significance of "the holy place" is difficult to determine. Is it implicit that another, purified Temple will once again stand in the holy place? Or is the holy place which God chose to remain forever untouched by any structure because of the spiritual abuses associated with the three previous temples?

---

[26] Charlesworth, *The Odes of Solomon*, p. 56, ns. 29, 30.

One passage in Ode 6 could throw some light on these questions if it were not in itself a difficult problem. Charlesworth translates Ode 6:8 in a way which affirms the positive association of the Temple with images of water and life in Ezekiel 47 (Ode 6:6-9):

> 6. The Lord has multiplied His knowledge,
> And He was zealous that those things should be known
> which through His grace have been given to us.
>
> 7. And His praise He gave us on account of His name;
> Our spirits praise His Holy Spirit.
>
> 8. For there went forth a stream, and it became a
> river great and broad;
> Indeed it carried away everything, and it shattered
> and brought (it) to the Temple.
>
> 9. And the restraints of men were not able to
> restrain it,
> Nor even the arts of them who habitually restrain
> water.

There is some difficulty, however, in the translation, as Charlesworth explains.[27] On the one hand, Charlesworth and other scholars understood the Lāmadh as a nota dativi and therefore translated the passage as above. As Charlesworth points out, the Coptic supports this translation: "It gathered all things and it turned towards the temple." On the other hand, other scholars translate the crucial second part of verse 8 differently. This second understanding of the verse is represented by the J. R. Harris -- A. Mingana translation: "It swept away everything, and broke up and carried away the Temple." This would indicate that the Odist rejected the Temple. If the translation of Charlesworth is correct, it is possible that the Temple (a new Temple?) is envisioned as having a place in Eternity (6:9 ff.). If the Harris-Mingana translation is correct, then the absence of the Temple in Ode 11 and the rejection of the Temple in Ode 6 would make it probable the Temple has no place in the apocayptic schemata of the Odes of Solomon. In light of Ode 4 the position of the Odist may have been similar to that of Revelation. Neither position can be maintained, however, with any certainty.

---

[27] Ibid., p. 31, n. 12.

Several other subjects in the Odes of Solomon deserve some attention in respect to the land-promise theme. First, reminiscent of Revelation's depiction of the Church, the saved community in the Odes of Solomon comprises both Jews and Gentiles as the true people of God. Second, the ideas involved in the motif of the symbolic "wheel" and "letter" in association with the kingdom of God in Ode 23 is similar to the concept reflected in Daniel 2 involving the stone and the establishment of God's kingdom. Finally, explicit reference is made to the patriarchal promises.

As in Revelation, the relationship of a believer to the true people of God is determined by the recognition of Jesus as the Christ (Odes of Solomon 33:12; 31:11-12; 10:5 ff.). The Jewish tone of "the people of God" is underscored throughout the Odes of Solomon in a number of ways. As we already indicated, salvation is depicted in the very Jewish terms of the land and Paradise. The elect are described as God's "planting" (38:22). As we pointed out in our discussion of the Letters of Bishop Ignatius, this was a Jewish term which designated Israel as God's people. In the Ascension of Isaiah this designation occurs in a context in which there is a definite association with the land and the messianic kingdom. Although there is no messianic kingdom in the Odes of Solomon, the term "planting" is used to indicate that God's people would be intimately associated with and secure in the land of salvation, the incorrupt and paradisical world of the New Age (11:18; 33:12).

One passage presents very clearly the Jewish orientation of the concept of the people of God. The passage is as follows (Ode 10:4-6):

> 4. I [Christ] took courage and became strong and
> captured the world,
>
> 5. And it became mine for the glory of the Most
> High, and of God my Father.
> And the Gentiles who had been dispersed were gathered
> together,
> But I was not defiled by my love (for them),
> Because they had praised me in high places.
>
> 6. And the traces of light were set upon their heart,
> And they walked according to my life and were saved,
> And they became my people for ever and ever.
> Hallelujah.

Charlesworth, who believed this passage was written by a Christian Palestinian Jew in the first century, referred to a comment of R. H. Charles which recognized the strong Jewish perspective concerning the admission of Gentiles into the people of God: "Christ apologizes after a fashion for His reception of the Gentiles into the Church..."[28] More appropriately in respect to this Jewish perspective, Christ apologizes for his reception of Gentiles into the "my people," the Israel of God. According to the Odist, the elect are understood as continuous with the redeemed of the Old Covenant -- there is one people of God (cf. 31:11-12).

The concept of the kingdom of God is given a future apocalyptic significance in the Odes of Solomon. Although the kingdom of God is sometimes used to indicate the present spiritual kingdom or the Church (18:3; 22:12), in Ode 23 it seems to have an apocalyptic significance similar to that in Daniel (2:44-45). In the passage in Daniel, the hope expressed is that God would bring an end to the fourth kingdom and the oppressive despotism which Israel had experienced under the successive corrupt empires. God would perform this by means of a "stone cut by no human hand" which would shatter the other kingdoms and fill the whole earth as a great mountain (2:34-35). In place of the corrupt and unbelieving kingdoms, God's kingdom would fill the whole earth and stand for ever (2:35, 44-45).

This is in substance the function of the symbolic "wheel" and "the letter" which are associated with God's kingdom. The use of "wheel" as a symbol may have been the result of the association in Jewish mysticism of the Merkabah with the Divine Presence (cf. Ezekiel 1:4-28; 10; Daniel 7:9; 1 Enoch 14:18). Inasmuch as the land of salvation in the Odes of Solomon is very close to Ezekiel's portrayal of the restored land, it is not inconceivable the Odist was influenced by the image of the wheels in that book. The same may be said of Daniel 7:9. It is interesting that in Ode 23, the wheel is particularly associated with what is a probable reference to Jesus on the cross.[28a]

---

[28] Ibid., p. 49, n. 9.

[28a] So Charlesworth, The Odes of Solomon, p. 96, n. 16. Cf., however, Daniel 2:31-44.

Could this be a subtle allusion to the divinity of Jesus? The "letter" probably signifies the sacred scriptures. The passages is as follows (Ode 23:10-22):

10. But those who saw the letter went after it;
That they might learn where it would land,
And who should read it,
And who should hear it.

11. But a wheel received it,
And it [the letter] came over it.

12. And a sign was with it,
Of the kingdom and of providence.

13. And everything which was disturbing the wheel,
It mowed and cut down.

14. And it restrained a multitude of adversaries;
And bridged rivers.

15. And it crossed over and uprooted many forests,[29]
And made an open way.

16. The head went down to the feet,
Because unto the feet ran the wheel,
And whatever had come upon it.

17. The letter was one of command,
And hence all regions were gathered together,

18. And there was seen at its head, the head which was revealed,
Even the Son of Truth from the Most High Father,

19. And He inherited and possessed everything,
And then the scheming of the many ceased.

20. Then all the seducers became headstrong and fled,
And the persecutors became extinct and were blotted out.

21. And the letter became a large volume,
Which was entirely written by the finger of God.

22. And the name of the Father was upon it;
And of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,
To rule for ever and ever.
Hallelujah.

---

[29] Cf. Judges 9:8 ff.

Charlesworth pointed out, the word "providence" in verse twelve may be translated either "government" or "the divine dispensation."[30] As in Daniel 2, it is probable that the hope expressed here is that the kingdom of God would overcome evil and establish its rule for ever.

One passage in the Odes of Solomon makes explicit reference to the patriarchal promises. The passage is Ode 31:6-13:

> 6. Come forth, you who have been afflicted,
> And receive joy.
>
> 7. And possess yourselves through grace,
> And take unto you immortal life.
>
> 8. And they condemned me when I stood up,
> Me who had not been condemned.
>
> 9. Then they divided my spoil,
> Though nothing was owed them.
>
> 10. But I endured and held my peace and was silent,
> That I might not be disturbed by them.
>
> 11. But I stood undisturbed like a solid rock,
> Which is continuously pounded by columns of waves and
> endures.
>
> 12. And I bore their bitterness because of humility;
> That I might redeem my nation and instruct it.
>
> 13. And that I might not nullify the promises to the
> patriarchs,
> To whom I was promised for the salvation of their
> offspring.
> Hallelujah.

The land is not mentioned in this context. "Immortal life" through Christ is what is presented as the fulfillment of the patriarchal promises. Yet, it is clear that the Odist believed the patriarchal promises must be fulfilled. Ultimately it is through Christ as the fulfillment of the promises that salvation would be experienced in the Edenic land of the New Age. There, the elect as the Bride of the Beloved (Ode 38:11; cf. Revelation 21:9; 22:17) would be the people of God's planting (Ode 38:21).

---

[30] Charlesworth, The Odes of Solomon, p. 96, n. 10.

One further word may be said concerning the prominence of the land image in the Odes of Solomon. George Wesley Buchanan argued that it is probable that the expression "land of life" in the Old Testament and non-canonical passages usually indicated the promised land (e.g. Psalm 27:13; 142:6). According to Buchanan, references to the "land of the living" by Hezekiah (Isaiah 38:11) and Jeremiah (11:19) probably did not signify a general reference to "life" but to life in Palestine. Although this is not certain, Buchanan believed the probability of this interpretation was enhanced by the fact that later Jews considered that the land of Israel was the "land of life." One of Buchanan's several references is as follows: Rabbi Tanhuma said, "The land of Israel is called the land of life (Tanhuma, Voyêsê 80b)."[31] This concept may have influenced the odist. Possibly, it is reflected in Ode 15:10:

> And eternal life has arisen in the Lord's land,
> And it has been declared to His faithful ones,
> And been given without limit to all that trust
> in Him. Hallelujah.

In the Odes of Solomon, the promise of blessing in the land is transformed through apocalyptic and is organically combined with the paradise motif in the Age to Come. This corresponds substantially to the Apocalypse of Peter, 2 Enoch, and probably the schemata of Books I, II and VII in the Christian Sibylline Oracles. It is reminiscent of the visions concerned with the ancient traditions about blessing in the land found in the oracles of Third Isaiah. With the paradisical imagery of the restored land in Ezekiel, the Odist was able to integrate the concept of blessing in Canaan with the Paradise of the Last Age and hold forth for the elect the promise of a heaven on earth as it were.

THE APOCALYPSE OF PETER

The Apocalypse of Peter is perhaps the earliest apocryphal revelation dating from within the first half of the second century.[32] Its dependence on Fourth Ezra and 2 Peter set the lower limit and its attestation by Clement of Alexandria sets the upper limit.[33] Further, it appears in the list of Muratorian Fragment with the warning that some would not have it read in Church.[34] Its place of composition is perhaps Egypt. Christian Maurer suggests that the reference in chapter ten to the Egyptian reverence for animals and the early attestation of Clement of Alexandria could indicate this.[35] But these arguments are not very strong. Indeed, the reference to idols in the form of cats, lions, reptiles, and wild beasts is no more an indication of an Egyptian origin of this writing than Romans 1:23 is an indication of its provenance. As to the attestation of Clement of Alexandria, it is not at all inconceivable that he was familiar with many Christian writings originating in places other than Alexandria. Certainly there was sufficient time for him to become acquainted with this writing if it did originate elsewhere. There is, perhaps, better reason to assign this writing to Syria.

---

[31] George Wesley Buchanan, The Consequences of the Covenant, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 20, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970, p. 129.

[32] Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 144; Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 142; Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 1069.

M. R. James, who followed Theodor Zahn's lead, proposed that the Ahkmin fragment reflects the Gospel of Peter.[36] This gospel, moreover, may with a good deal of confidence be assigned to Syria because of the attestation of Serapion who related that it was used by some in his diocese.[37] Certain connections with the Syriac Didascalia may indicate this (chapter 21 with the Gospel of Peter 2, 5, 27, 35, 60).[38] This may indicate, however, no more than the fact that the Akhmin fragment, and not the original Apocalypse of Peter, had its origin in Syria. Further, James demonstrated that the Rainer Fragment anticipated part of book two of the Christian Sibyllines (333-338), a work which may have originated in Syria.[39] Any place in the East, in fact, would be possible; and considering the diversity of the Church in Rome at this time, even this is possible. Yet, due to the close similarity between this apocalypse and the Odes of Solomon in the use of the concept of promised land, Syria is favored by the present writer.

---

[33] Christian Maurer, introduction to the Apocalypse of Peter in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 664 (hereafter cited as Apocalypse of Peter). All citations are from this translation.

[34] Morton Scott Enslin, "Peter, Apocalypse of," IDB, vol. 3, p. 758.

[35] Maurer, Apocalypse of Peter, p. 664.

[36] Montague R. James, "The Rainer Fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter," Journal of Theological Studies, 32, 1931, p. 275 (hereafter cited as "Rainer Fragment").

[37] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 124; Christian Maurer, introduction to the Gospel of Peter in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, p. 180 (hereafter cited as Gospel of Peter).

[38] Maurer, Gospel of Peter, p. 180.

It should be noted that at the present time the Ethiopic translation (E) of the Apocalypse of Peter is preferred over the Akhmin Greek text (A). Indeed, the Ethiopic translation is regarded as presenting, on the whole, a faithful representation of the original Apocalypse of Peter.[40] This is, however, not certain. Moreover, the Rainer Fragment, dating from perhaps the third or fourth century, is according to M. R. James preferred over the Ethiopic for chapter fourteen.[41]

In the Apocalypse of Peter, we have an extremely interesting use of several motifs which make this writing difficult to place in terms of the concept of the promised land. For the subjects of the second coming, the final judgment, the kingdom, the earth as a creation for the elect, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the transfiguration, and Paradise all appear in this book. Indeed, the only other books which present such diversity are the Revelation and the Odes of Solomon.

We have placed both the Revelation and the Odes of Solomon, perhaps the most complex representative in terms of the land-promise, in the catalogue of writings affirming the concept of the promised land as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. We hope to establish solid ground for placing the Apocalypse of Peter in the same catalogue of literature.

---

[39] James, "Rainer Fragment," p. 272.

[40] Maurer, Apocalypse of Peter, p. 665.

[41] James, "Rainer Fragment," pp. 270-271, 278; cf. Maurer, Apocalypse of Peter, p. 679, n. 3.

The Apocalypse of Peter gives evidence of a concern for the destiny of Israel as the historic people of God. In chapter two, there appears the parable of the fig tree which serves to explain why Israel has been rejected by God. The passage, which depends on Luke 13:6 ff., stresses the forebearance of God in his reluctance to uproot the people of his planting. Indeed, the passage which depends on Luke shows not only a concern with the destiny of Israel, but also with the land of Israel (Apocalypse of Peter 2):

> Dost thou not understand that the fig tree is the house of Israel? Even as a man hath planted a fig tree in his garden and it brought forth no fruit, and he sought its fruit for many years. When he found it not, he said to the keeper of his garden, 'Uproot the fig tree that our land may not be unfruitful for us.' And the gardener said to God, 'We thy servants (?) wish to clear it (of weeds) and to dig the ground around it and to water it. If it does not then bear fruit, we will immediately remove its roots from the garden and plant another one in its place.' Hast thou not grasped that the fig tree is Israel?

In order to determine the significance of land in the context of this parable, a digression is necessary to examine Luke's parable and the significance of land there.

As W. D. Davies has pointed out in his discussion of the parable of the fig tree, only in Luke is there the introduction of the concept of land.[42] The parallels in both Mark and Matthew draw no attention whatever to the land the fig tree occupied (Mark 11:12-14, 20-21; Matthew 21:18-20). In these parallel passages, the emphasis is definitely on the rejection of Israel, a fact which for both Mark and Matthew had already taken place. We may, moreover, go further than Davies' observation on Luke's reference to the land and emphasis of the "patience of the judge." There is, in fact, a good indication that Luke is interested in stressing not only the forebearance of God but also the proper use of the land.

---

[42] Davies, Gospel and the Land, p. 355.

W. D. Davies is certainly correct in his evaluation of the significance of the fig tree in both Mark and Matthew -- that the emphasis in both is the judgment of the people of Israel which has already taken place.[43] Yet, we believe he has overlooked an important detail in his discussion of the term "land" in the parable in Luke in his attempt to understand it variously as land, earth, soil or place (τὸν τοπόν) which is the substitution by the corrector of B.[44] This, in fact, is largely beside the point, and if our evaluation is correct any one of these meanings would fit just as well. Rather, the focus should be on the place of the fig tree in a larger sense.

In both Mark and Matthew, the concept of the place of the fig tree is not relevant to the single theological assertion that Israel has been rejected. The fig tree therefore is presented "in the distance" in Mark and "by the wayside" in Matthew. In short, the fig tree and not its place -- or more specifically, the fig tree without reference to its place -- is what is important to Mark and Matthew. In Luke, it is different. The fig tree is not presented in just any place, but on the contrary, in the significant context of the owner's vineyard. Whether it was growing in the earth, the soil, a place, or in the land, it was in the man's personal vineyard, i.e., the land of Canaan. Luke, therefore, who is well aware of the promise of the land to Abraham, the Davidic tradition and promises and the expectations of the historic people of God in light of these promises and the prophets (Luke 1:14-17; 32-35; 47-55; 67-77; 2:29-35; 3:4-6) undertook an explanation of Israel's destiny in terms of both land and people -- for both belonged to God (Leviticus 25:23). Aware of the difficulty presented by these historic and enduring promises, Luke, therefore, as did later the author of the Acts of Paul, took pains to stress the forebearance of God in uprooting Israel from the land. In this respect, W. D. Davies surely points in the right direction:

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid., pp. 355-356.

> But are we to ascribe any special significance to Luke's reference to the land? Did he here mean to claim that for Jesus the judgment on Israel included or would incur separation from the land?
>
> Certain considerations favour an affirmative answer.[45]

Is this the significance of the land in the fig tree parable in the *Apocalypse of Peter*? If anything, the reference to the land seems to be heightened by our author! "Uproot the fig tree that our land may not be unfruitful for us...remove its roots from the garden and plant another one in its place."[46] Yet, the use of the land and the garden (i.e., Luke's vineyard) is different from that of Luke. True, there is in both the idea of Israel being removed from the land, and in this respect the answer must be given in the affirmative. To be sure, the concept of the land has not been ignored or rejected in this context. Yet, in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the emphasis is on the fruitfulness of the people of God. The concern is not the land *per se* -- the land in respect to any historic or enduring promises -- but rather fruitfulness.

The author of this apocalypse, further, seems to suggest that some of Israel would be fruitful and others would be judged and rejected. For although some -- who did not honor Christ as did "our fathers" -- would follow false Christs and crucify the real Christ, others would reject a deceiver and through martyrdom be reckoned among the good and righteous. In this way, the boughs of the fig tree, the house of Israel, would have sprouted (*Apocalypse of Peter* 2). Therefore, the land as such, does not have any real significance, but only serves to heighten the idea of the necessity of fruitfulness. The land is certainly not the goal of an apocalyptic hope based on any of the historic traditions, Abrahamic, Mosaic, or Davidic.

Another passage in this writing makes reference to Ezekiel 37:4 ff. This powerful image of resurrection was originally understood in terms of the restoration of Israel to the promised land. This is made explicit in Ezekiel 37:11 ff. There is no question that in Ezekiel, the concept of the promised land as an apocalyptic hope of the people of God played a prominent role in which the Abrahamic, Mosaic and Davidic traditions were reflected. But here in this context the image is used exclusively in terms of resurrection. The significance, therefore, which was originally given this image, is not reflected in the Apocalypse of Peter, and there is no indication that the concept of the promised land was, in this passage, of any importance to the author.

---

[45] Ibid., p. 355.

[46] Maurer, *Apocalypse of Peter*, p. 669.

One concept that appears in the Apocalypse of Peter was frequently related to the promise of blessing in the land. It is the same idea we encountered in Hermas -- that the world was made for the elect. Further, we pointed out that this concept, although frequently linked to the Jewish apocalyptic concept of inheritance, does not have this significance in Hermas. Rather, in Hermas the focus is on the Church as the culmination of God's plan of salvation -- a plan which in a protological sense preceded the world and stood as the eschatological goal of creation (cf. Hermas, Visions i.6). It was in this sense that the world was created for the Church.

So too, in the Apocalypse of Peter, there is a different theological intention involved in this concept than that which predominated the pseudepigraphic literature. Here, the earth is created for the elect as a guardian of the believer's body, which upon death is sown in the earth as a seed of the resurrection to come. The passage which makes this clear is in chapter four as follows:

> Behold and consider the corns of wheat which are sown in the earth. As something dry and without a soul does a man sow them in the earth; and they live again, bear fruit, and the earth gives them back again as a pledge entrusted to it. And this which dies, which is sown as seed in the earth and shall become alive and be restored to life, is man. How much more shall God raise up on the day of decision those who believe in him and are chosen by him and for whom he made the earth, and all this shall the earth give back on the day of decision, since it shall also be judged with them, and the heaven with it.[47]

According to the Apocalypse of Peter, therefore, the earth was made for the elect so that it could be entrusted with their bodies until the

---

[47] Ibid., p. 670.

the resurrection on the day of the decision of the judgment of God. There is not the least indication that the earth was made for the elect as an apocalyptic inheritance in which they could ultimately realize the promise of blessing in the land. In other words, the world is not made for the elect as a goal to be inherited, but as a means of attaining the resurrected life. Indeed, the earth together with heaven is dissolved in the judgment, and the elect go to be with Christ in Eternity (chapter 5-6).

This brings us to a discussion of the overall apocalyptic schemata of this apocalypse which can be described as that of the Two Ages. It is clear from the section in chapters four, five, and six that this world continues as it is until the day of judgment, at which time the whole creation is dissolved and, after the resurrection, the damned are assigned to eternal punishment and the elect are given eternal life with Christ. There is no room for a temporary messianic kingdom, nor is there any indication that the elect will reign with Christ in the Age to Come in any sense which would reflect the Davidic tradition of the promised land. Indeed, it is emphasized that the elect together with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the other righteous fathers will share the same rest in the eternal kingdom which is characterized as Paradise (chapter 16 E).[48] There is, however, one passage which clearly reflects the promises to the fathers as a reason for fulfilling their salvation in terms of rest in Paradise.

---

[48] Ibid., p. 681. Cf. Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions, Texts and Translations 2, Pseudepigrapha ser. 2, trans. Michael E. Stone, recension A, chapter 20, pp. 55-56: "...And they tended righteous Abraham's body with divine ointments and perfumes until the third day after his death, and they buried him in the promised land at the oak of Mamre. And the angels escorted his precious soul and ascended to the heavens singing the trishagion hymn to the Master of all, to God, and they set it in obeisance to God and Father. And after there was great hymning and praising of the Lord, and Abraham made obiesance, the undefiled voice of God and Father came saying thus, 'Take, therefore, my friend Abraham to the garden (paradise), where the tabernacles of my righteous ones and abodes of my holy ones Isaac and Jacob are in his bosom, where there is no toil, no sadness, no sighing, but peace and joy and endless life.'"

The passage is found in chapter fourteen. Were it only for the Ethiopic translation, the decision would have to be that this writing should be placed in the catalogue of those works which do not affirm the promise of blessing in the land as a significant reason for the salvation of the elect in terms of a territorial aspect. Indeed, neither the land nor the promises with the possibility of land as a central referent is present in the Ethiopic translation which is as follows:

> Then will I give to my elect and righteous the baptism and the salvation for which they have besought me, in the field Akrosja [=Acherusia] which is called Aneslasleja [=Elysium]. They shall adorn with flowers the portion of the righteous and I will go...I will rejoice with them. I will cause the nations to enter into my eternal kingdom and show to them that eternal thing to which I have directed their hope, I and my heavenly Father.[49]

From this passage, we could conclude that the final destiny of the elect was pictured as the eternal kingdom or the New Age. Further, the concept of Paradise could be understood as reflected here in the sense of the first Age reappearing in the last age (Testament of Levi 18:10; Testament of Dan 5:12; First Enoch 25:4 ff.). Even if a similarity between Eden, the land of Adam and Eve, and the promised land of Abraham, Moses and David, was intended by both J and P, it would not be put forward clearly here. This, however, is not our only version of this passage.

The Rainer fragment which according to M. R. James preserves the original better, clearly refers to the promises to the fathers. There is, moreover, reason to believe that the original was altered because it supported a curious view which could be considered dangerous to the doctrine concerning the eternal damnation of those who were not saved at the last judgment. That is, the original, as preserved in the Rainer fragment, advanced the idea that the righteous could pray for those consigned to eternal punishment, with the result being that the prayed-for-damned could be transferred to heaven as in the Acts of Paul 26-31 and possibly the Epistle of the Apostles 40 (similarly the Testament of Abraham, recension A, 12-14). The passage is as follows:

---

[49] Maurer, Apocalypse of Peter, p. 679.

> Then will I give unto my called and my chosen whomsoever they shall ask me for, out of torment, and will give them a fair baptism in (or unto) salvation from the Acherusian lake which men so call in the Elysian field, even a portion of righteousness with my holy ones. And I will depart, I and my chosen, rejoicing, with the patriarchs, unto mine eternal kingdom, and I will perform for them the promises which I promised them, I and my Father which is in heaven.[50]

On the basis of this fragment, then, the conclusion that seems most probable is the one we made concerning the Odes of Solomon: the promise of blessing in the land is transformed through apocalyptic and is related to salvation in Paradise, the land of Eden in which man was first blessed and had the hope of eternal life.

---

[50] James, "Rainer Fragment," p. 271.

CHAPTER 3

EASTERN

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

Three other writings of probable Eastern origin deserve to be mentioned: The Ascension of Isaiah; the Christian Sibyllines; and Fourth Ezra. It is probable that none of these pseudepigraphs were originally a unified whole, but were compiled from various sources. Neither were all of the various sources composed by the end of the second century. Yet, there is material pertinent to our subject in the sections of each writing which probably originated in the late first or second century.

It is likely that the Ascension of Isaiah is a compilation of two principal sources: a Jewish account concerning legends about Beliar and the martyrdom of Isaiah (1-5); and a Christian depiction of Isaiah's ascent through the heavens (6-11). A Christian interpolation of a little apocalypse, the "Testament of Hezekiah," comprises a section of the first part. This interpolation begins in 3:13. Its conclusion has been variously assessed: 4:18;[1] 4:22;[2] and 5:1.[3] The "Testament of Hezekiah" is probably to be dated in the second century.[4] It is possible that another interpolation comprises a section of chapter eleven in the second part.[5] The second part (6-11) may be as late as the third or early fourth century.[6]

---

[1] R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p. 155; Martin Rist, "Isaiah, Ascension of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 744, sec. 2.

[2] Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 716.

[3] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 119; Hugo Duensing, introduction to The Ascension of Isaiah in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 643 (hereafter cited as Ascension of Isaiah). All citations are from this translation.

[4] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 119.

[5] Duensing, Ascension of Isaiah, p. 643.

[6] Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 716; Rist, "Isaiah, Ascension of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 746.

UMI

It is probable that the "Testament of Hezekiah" affirms the concept of the land as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. Both its depiction of an antichrist like Nero and its apocalyptic schemata correspond remarkably well with Revelation (4:2-14; cf. Revelation 12:6, 14; 13:5 ff.; 16:14; 19:20; 20:7-9). The order of events put forward in this apocalyptic section is that at the second advent of Christ, Beliar (antichrist) and his hosts will be destroyed. Then the faithful who are still living, together with the Lord and his saints, will enjoy rest in the world (4:4-16). Afterwards, the elect with Christ will ascend in heavenly bodies (?) and the wicked will be annihilated (4:17-18).

Reference to this section of the Ascension of Isaiah has already been made above in respect to the term "Plantation" as a designation for the Church.[7] The passage which is important for this study is as follows (4:15-17):

> ...and he (Christ) will bring rest to the pious who shall be found alive in the body in this world (and the sun shall grow red with shame), 16. and to all who through faith in him have cursed Beliar and his kings. But the saints will come with the Lord in their garments which are stored on high in the seventh heaven; with the Lord they will come, whose spirits are clothed, they will descend and be present in the world, and those who are found in the body will be strengthened by the image of the saints in the garments of the saints, and the Lord will minister to those who were watchful in the world. And afterwards they will turn themselves upwards in their garments but their body will remain in the world.[8]

It ought to be noted that no mention is made of the patriarchal promises, the Davidic-Zionic traditions (the reign of Christ and the saints, Jerusalem, the Temple) or paradisical fecundity. Yet, the concept of blessing in the land seems to be implicit in the "rest" which the righteous enjoy in this world after the second advent of Christ.

---

[7] See p. 94 above.

[8] Duensing, Ascension of Isaiah, p. 649.

THE CHRISTIAN SIBYLLINES

It is likely that as early as the second century Eastern Christians made additions to the Jewish Sibyllines.[9] Books VI, VII, and VIII are very likely of purely Christian origin. Books VI and VIII probably date to the last half of the second century. Book VII makes use of Book VI and may belong to the late second or early third century. Both Books VI and VII have been judged by some to reflect Gnostic theology.[10] Books VI, VII and VIII are somewhat important for this study because of the evidence they show of some Jewish-Christian themes and their severely critical attitude toward the Roman Empire. More important for the specific examination of the land-promise theme are Books I and II. It is these latter Books that merit our examination in respect to the land-promise theme.

Books I and II, which were probably of Jewish origin, in their present form "despite some gaps and roughness constitute a beautiful whole."[11] They are to be dated after A.D. 100 for at least three reasons: The First Jewish War is presupposed (I, 387 ff.); the scattered Hebrews are depicted as enemies of the Church (II, 250); and parts of Book I and II are used in Books VII and VIII. If Book II contains a veiled reference to the revolt of Bar Cochba, a date around A.D. 150 may be probable (II, 165-173).[12]

Most of the traditions associated with the land-promise theme are reflected in Books I and II: The Patriarchs, Moses, the triumphant Davidic King, Jerusalem, and Paradise are clearly put forward as significant elements of the overall apocalyptic schemata concerning the salvation and blessing of the elect. It is possible that the messianic age and the mythology of the cosmic week are also present in this schemata.

---

[9] Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 1272.

[10] Alfons Kurfess, introduction to the Christian Sibyllines in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 707-708 (hereafter cited as Christian Sibyllines). All citations are from this translation.

[11] Ibid., p. 707.

[12] Cf. ibid., p. 708.

A sense of continuity between the Church as the New Israel and the Old Covenant saints of Israel is emphasized in these two books.

In Books I-II the assertion is made that the Church is the New Israel. Because the nation of Israel "ill-used" the Son of God, Christ, God in a raging fury took away their faith (I, 345 ff.; 360 ff.). The Temple was destroyed and "fell to the holy earth [the promised land?]" in the First Jewish War; and the Jews were driven from the land as punishment for their sin (I, 387 ff.). In place of national Israel, the Gentiles were elected to become the people of God, the New Israel (I, 345-359; 383-386; II, 174-176). Ultimately, apostate national Israel would be judged for her treatment of the Old Covenant saints, Christ, and the Church (II, 237 ff.). In contrast to the destiny of apostate Israel, the New Israel would be united with the elect of the Old Covenant and enjoy the salvation provided by God (II, 174-176; 245-249; 313 ff.).

The Davidic and Zionic traditions are reflected in a presentation of events and blessings which in the Asiatic writings are associated with the inaugural messianic age. After a description of the first Advent of Christ, the adoration of the wise men "with gold, myrrh and frankincense," the rejection of the Jews, the adoption of the New Israel, and the Jewish War, it is declared that God would make a great sign. This sign will take place in heaven (II, 34 ff.). After this will follow blessings typical in other writings of the messianic age. Language reminiscent of the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem is used to depict the drama (II, 35-55; 149-153):

> And then shall God thereafter make a great sign.
> For like a radiant crown a star shall shine,
> Radiant and brightly beaming from the brilliant heaven
> For not a few days; for then he will show from heaven
> A victor's crown for men who contend in the contest.
> And then shall come the time of the great triumphal
>   entry
> Into the heavenly city, and it shall be universal
> For all men, and have the renown of immortality.
> And then shall every people in immortal contests
> Contend for glorious victory; for there shall none
> Be able shamelessly to purchase a crown for silver.
> For Christ the holy shall adjudge to them just rewards,
> And crown the excellent, and a prize immortal he will
>   give
> To martyrs who endure the contest even unto death.

> And to virgins who run their course well a prize
> incorruptible
> He will give, and to all among men who deal justly
> And to nations from far-distant lands
> Who live holy lives and recognize one God.
> And those who love marriage and abstain from stolen
> unions,
> Rich gifts will he give to them also, and eternal hope.
> For every soul of men is a gift of God,
> And it is not lawful for men to defile it with all
> manner of shame. . .
> This is the contest, these the prizes, these the
> awards;
> This is the gate of life and entry to immortality
> Which the heavenly God appointed for righteous men
> As guerdon of victory. They who receive
> The crown nobly shall enter in by it.

It is probable that it is during this time that the New Israel would rule with Christ. Whether or not the passage allowed for the restoration at least in part of the nation of Israel at some future time is not clear (II, 174-176):

> Elect and faithful Hebrews, when they have brought
> them
> To slavery as of old, for power shall never leave
> them.

It is difficult to determine the significance of the phrase, "for power shall never leave them." This could be an allusion to the Old Covenant promises involved in the patriarchal and Davidic traditions in respect to heirs and dominion. This thesis may be supported by the later reference to prominent Old Covenant saints who together with the Church enjoy the future bliss of the elect.

After a vivid description of the resurrection, there follows an account of the judgment at which Christ, his blameless angels, and some of the Old Covenant saints are present. Special prominence is given to those Old Covenant persons who epitomize the three significant traditions associated with the concept of the land: the patriarchal, the Mosaic and the Davidic traditions. This is evident in the following passage (II, 241-248):

> There shall come on a cloud to the eternal, eternal
> himself,
> Christ in glory [Davidic] with his blameless angels,
> And shall sit on the right hand of Majesty, judging
> on his throne

> The life of the pious and the ways of impious men.
> There shall come also Moses, the great friend of the
> Most High [Mosaic]
> Clothed in flesh; great Abraham too shall come [Patriarchal]
> Isaac and Jacob, Joshua, Daniel and Elias,
> Habakkuk and Jonah, and they whom the Hebrews slew.

It may be that King David was not mentioned because Christ was considered to have superseded David altogether -- Christ was the "David" par excellence.

It should be noted that nowhere is a temporary or inaugural messianic age explicitly put forward. The difficulty in determining whether or not the blessings described in Book II, 35-153 are to be understood as a messianic age is augmented by the fact that the schemata outlined is not strictly sequential. As in Revelation, the apocalyptic drama approaches the consummation only to be followed by an excursus or parenthetical vision. These sections of digression generally commented on what was foretold and alerted the reader to signs which would indicate how and when these events would occur (e.g. II, 154-173 which may include an allusion to the rebellion of Bar Cochba; cf. Fourth Ezra 13:39 ff.; Apocalypse of Peter 2).

One passage may support a conclusion recognizing a messianic age in Book II. In an attempt to show that God's severe judgment of the damned is a just one, the following statement is advanced (II, 308-312):

> For neither death nor night shall give them rest
> any more.
> Many an appeal, but in vain, shall they make to
> God who rules on high,
> And then will he openly turn away his face from
> them.
> For seven age-long days of repentance did he
> give
> To erring men...

It is probable that this passage contains the doctrine of the cosmic week which we mentioned in our discussion of Barnabas.

Kraft has indicated that the concept of the cosmic week or millennial epochs "antedates the book of Jubilees" where it is used to explain how Adam died in "the day" he ate the forbidden fruit

(Jubilees, 4:30 ff.).[13] Kraft's suggestion concerning this concept, however, is too enthusiastic. In Jubilees, the explanation of Adam's death is hardly more than a pious exegesis in light of the poetic conjecture expressed in Psalm 90:4: "a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past" (cf. 2 Peter 3:8). As Nevill Forbes and R. H. Charles pointed out, to arrive at the theory of the cosmic week it was necessary to take the exegesis of Jubilees a bit further.[14] In addition to Barnabas, this extension of the idea expressed in Psalm 90, Jubilees, and 2 Peter is found in Irenaeus' Against Heresies, v. 28.3 and 2 Enoch 32:2 ff. We may with a good deal of confidence include the Sibylline passage just quoted as among those affirming the doctrine of the cosmic week. This brings us to the following question: What is the significance of the cosmic week in deference to the messianic age in Book II, 311? Does it, like Barnabas and Irenaeus, affirm the seventh "age-long" day as the messianic age? Or does it, like 2 Enoch, perhaps a Jewish-Christian writing of the second century, give no clear evidence of or reason for a messianic age within the scope of the cosmic week?

Jean Daniélou maintained that another passage provides evidence that in the Christian Sibyllines the seventh millenium is seen as corresponding to the seventh day of creation, on which God rested, and is associated with the messianic reign regarded as the repose of the saints.[15] If this were true, it may have some bearing on the passage in Book II. The passage to which Daniélou referred is found in Book VII, 145-149. It is more appropriate, however, to judge the significance of this passage by observing a larger context than that to which Daniélou made reference. The passage is as follows (VII, 140-152):

> Of the first Ogdoad, again another world is seen.
> Night shall be everywhere over earth, long and hateful.
> And then shall the dread odour of brimstone spread
> around,

---

[13] Kraft, Apostolic Fathers, ed. Robert Grant, vol. 3, p. 128.

[14] Forbes-Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p. 451 (n. on 33:1-2).

[15] Danielou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 383, n. 10, 395-400.

> Announcing murders, when those shall perish
> In a terror of the night. Then will he beget
> a pure mind
> Of men, and set up thy race as it was before.
> No more shall any cut the deep furrow with the
> crooked plough,
> No cattle plunge the guiding iron downward;
> No vine-twig shall there be, nor cluster, but at
> the same time all
> Shall eat with white teeth the dewy manna.
> Then God too shall be with them and shall teach
> them
> As he taught unhappy me! What evils did I do
> aforetime
> Knowing! And many other things I wrought wickedly,
> taking no thought.

It must be admitted that one could read into this passage the concept of the messianic age. After a dark period of tribulation there would follow the light and repose of the messianic age. Then(after that) God would be with man, similar to the sequence outlined in Revelation.

Daniélou maintained cessation of the production of life and a kind of repose of the creation, envisioned in Book VII, belongs to the messianic age. In support of this, he makes a comparison with Methodius' Banquet of Ten Virgins 9:1 where this does take place in "the seventh thousand of years."[16] Perhaps this passage in Book VII was an elaboration of the theme of a messianic age which was believed to be inherent in Book II. There is another interpretation, however, which may be maintained. The repose in the Christian Sibyllines may occur in the New Age as it does in 2 Enoch.

It must be noted that 2 Enoch must be used with strong reservation. Recent scholarship has questioned the date of the longer version A, the abridged recension of the longer version, B, and the book as a whole. The shorter version, R, differs in the passage concerning the duration of the world (33:1 ff.). The shorter version "speaks only of the cessation of time after the great judgment, and of its fusion with the great aeon..."[17] Questions of date have not yet been decided with absolute certainty.[18] We would proceed with an examination of material in 2 Enoch which may possibly date to the second century.

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 394-395.

[17] Arie Rubenstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," Journal of Jewish Studies, 13, 1962, p. 21 (hereafter cited as "Slavonic Book of Enoch").

In the long version of 2 Enoch 33:1 ff. the cosmic week is followed by an eighth day in which the repose of creation is experienced. In all probability this is to be understood as the "time" of the New Age, Eternity. The passage is as follows (2 Enoch 33:1-2).

> And I appointed the eighth day also, that the eighth day should be the first-created after my work, and that the first seven revolve in the form of the seventh thousand, and that at the beginning of the eighth thousand there should be a time of not-counting, endless, with neither years nor months nor weeks nor days nor hours.[19]

This could be the significance of the "repose" in Book VII of the Christian Sibyllines -- after a dark period of tribulation, this would be followed by the New Age. Further, the sequence in 2 Enoch, is almost exactly that of Book II, 311 ff.

After an account of the fate of the damned and the mention of the seven "age-long days," the attention in Book II immediately turns to the salvation of the elect. Their lot is a paradisical earth in the New Age. The similarities between the abode of the saved in Book II and the Paradise of the saved in 2 Enoch is striking (Book II, 313-329; cf. 2 Enoch 8:1-10:1, recensions A and B). The passage in Book II follows the event of the last judgment and clearly presents the state of salvation in the New Age. Here, the "repose" of creation may be ascertained with certainty as belonging not to a messianic age but to Eternity

---

[18] J. T. Milik dates 2 Enoch to the ninth or tenth centuries A.D. Books of Enoch, p. 110. But see Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 460; Rubenstein, "Slavonic Book of Enoch," p. 20, n. 62. It is interesting that the land-promise theme is affirmed in a section of 3 Enoch which Hugo Odeberg dated earlier than the third century (3 Enoch 48 A:10). Hugo Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch, reprint of the 1928 ed., with a prolegomenon by Jonas C. Greenfield (1972), New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1973, pp. 38-39, 158-159. In the prolegomenon of this book, Greenfield criticized Milik's dating of 2 Enoch as too late to be taken seriously (p. XVII).In the part of 3 Enoch which Odeberg dated a little earlier than A.D. 200 (chapters 41-48A) the land-promise theme is definitely present (48:10). Third Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch, introduction, pp. 38-39; text, pp. 158-159.

[19] Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p. 451. All references of 2 Enoch in translation are to this edition.

(Book II, 313-329):

> Angels shall bear them through the burning river
> And bring them to light and to a carefree life,
> Where runs the immortal path of great God
> And there are threefold springs of wine and milk
> and honey.
> Earth the same for all, not divided by walls
> And fences, will then bear fruits more abundant
> Of its own accord; livelihood held in common,
> wealth unapportioned!
> No pauper is there, no rich man, nor any tyrant,
> No slave, nor again any great, nor shall any be
> small,
> No kings, no rulers; but all share in common.
> No longer shall any say "Night fell," nor again
> "Tomorrow"
> Nor "It happened yesterday," nor be concerned with
> many days,
> Nor spring nor harvest, nor winter nor autumn,
> Nor marriage nor death, nor buying nor selling,
> Nor sunset and sunrise; for all is one long day.

Here, as in 2 Enoch, the image of Paradise and the Promised Land of milk and honey is clearly expressed (cf. Barnabas, 6:8-19). The passage in 2 Enoch reflects even stronger the centrality of the "milk and honey" image. Whereas, Book II describes three springs of wine, milk, and honey, 2 Enoch makes a twofold spring of milk and honey the source of two additional streams of oil and wine. Further, in 2 Enoch, it is explicit that the New Age (in which the righteous will enjoy the paradisical earth) will immediately follow this present age (2 Enoch 65:1-10, recensions A and B).

This argument does not establish the significance of the cosmic week in Book II. Nor does it determine the time of repose described in Book VII. There was a variety of ideas expressed about the day-age concept by the various writers who embraced this notion. The book of 1 Enoch provides early evidence of a concept involving ten weeks of epochs. In 1 Enoch the messianic age seems to take place in the eighth week of epochs (91:12-14a). In the Epistle of Barnabas, this period of rest may occur either in the seventh millenium or in an interim between the messianic age and the Age to Come -- although the latter possibility is unlikely. Caution therefore is recommended when a messianic age is not explicitly designated in one of the ages indicated in these various apocalyptic schemata.

UMI

In conclusion, the concept of the promised land as an apocalyptic motif is affirmed in the Christian Sibyllines. The apocalyptic schemata reflect most of the traditions associated with the land-promise theme. The depictions of the future abode of the saints in respect to the land seems to be closer to that expressed in the Odes of Solomon and the Apocalypse of Peter than to that presented by the Asiatic writers.

4 EZRA: CHAPTERS 1 and 2

The only apocalypse in the Old Testament Apocrypha, 4 Ezra (2 Esdras in RSV; 4 Esdras in the Vulgate), is a composite work of three principle sources: the central and original apocalyptic work (3-14); a later introductory addition (1-2); a final appended conlusion (15-16). The date and titles of this book and its various parts are problematic and confusing.[20]

Fourth Ezra, the original Jewish apocalypse, probably was written after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 in Palestine.[21] Later, an unknown Christian added an anti-Jewish introduction. Hugo Duensing advanced the argument that the innumerable company of Christian martyrs which are crowned (2:42-47) suggests a date near the end of the second century for the introductory chapters.[22] The evident weakness of this argument is apparent from the witness of Revelation alone. Nigel Turner believed it was not at all improbable that chapters one through fourteen were published as a book around A.D. 96.[23] Bruce Metzger suggested a date near the middle of the second century for chapters 1-2.[24] Metzger offered no compelling reasons for this date, and there is no reason Fourth Ezra 1-2 could not have been nearly contemporary with Revelation in its publication.[25] It is probable that Fourth Ezra 15-16 is the last addition and is to be dated in the third century.[26]

---

[20] The title the Ezra Apocalypse is used to designate the book as a whole, the original Jewish apocalypse (3-14), or chapters one through fourteen. The title Fifth Esdras is sometimes used to designate the last two chapters (15-16). In Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, pp. 689 ff., 4 Ezra signifies the original portion (3-14); 5 Ezra signifies the introductory section (1-2); 6 Ezra designates the concluding chapters (15-16).

[21] Bruce M. Metzger, ed., notes, The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Standard Version, New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 23 (hereafter cited as Apocrypha of O.T.). All citations are from this translation. Joshua Bloch believed six verses in the original Ezra-Apocalypse are Christian interpolations (7:28, 29; 13:32, 37, 52; 14.9). "Some Christian Interpolations in the Ezra-Apocalypse," Harvard Theological Review, 51, 1958, pp. 88-89.

[22] Hugo Duensing, introduction to The Fifth and Sixth Books of Esra in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, p. 689 (hereafter cited as Fifth Esra).

The place of composition is not known. Palestine is a likely candidate for Fourth Ezra 1-2 if Turner's date is adopted. This is only a guess however. Any place in the western Orient, as Duensing suggests, is possible.[27]

In Fourth Ezra 1-2 the concept of the land-promise theme is affirmed as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. The patriarchal, the Mosaic and the Davidic-Zionic traditions are clearly reflected. The Paradise motif is also present.

Several passages make clear that God has rejected national Israel (1:24 ff.; 2:10 ff.; 2:33). As in the Acts of Paul, it is proclaimed that God is justified in his rejection of national Israel because of the great benefits he bestowed on Israel (Fourth Ezra 1:9). The events of the Exodus and the occupation of Canaan are explicitly brought forward as condemning testimony (1:12-28). It is argued that Israel's iniquities in respect to the Mosaic law are sufficient ground for her loss of the kingdom (1:24; 2:13-14). Further accusations are advanced in respect to Israel's ill-treatment of the prophets and ultimate rejection of Christ (1:32, 36; 2:33). The judgment which Ezra was commanded to announce was that God had rejected national Israel and chosen a new people (1:24).

---

[23] Nigel Turner, "Esdras, Books of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 142.

[24] Metzger, Apocrypha of O.T. p. 23.

[25] Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, II Esdras (The Ezra Apocalypse), London: Methuen and Company, 1933, p. xliv.

[26] Montague Rhodes James, introduction to The Fourth Book of Ezra: Latin Version Edited from the MSS by Robert L. Bensly, Cambridge: At the University Press, 1895, p. lxxviii; Turner, "Esdras, Books of," IDB, vol. 2, p. 142.

[27] Duensing, Fifth Esra, p. 690.

The new people chosen by God are described in terms that indicate they are the New Israel. The new people would keep the statutes of God and be given his Name (1:24). The Christians would have Zion-Jerusalem as their mother so that the full number of Zion's elect might be fulfilled (2:10, 15; 40). One passage blends the motifs of paradise and Canaan to describe the care and blessedness of the newly chosen people (2:15-19):

> Mother, embrace your sons; bring them up with gladness, as does the dove; establish their feet, because I have chosen you, says the Lord. And I will raise up the dead from their places, and will bring them out from their tombs, because I recognize my name in them. Do not fear mother of the sons, for I have chosen you, says the Lord. I will send you help, my servants Isaiah and Jeremiah. According to their counsel I have consecrated and prepared for you twelve trees loaded with various fruits, and the same number of springs flowing with milk and honey, and seven mighty mountains on which roses and lilies grow by these I will fill your children with joy.

Further, the dwellings of national Israel would be given to the Church.

One passage makes an explicit reference to the land of Canaan in the sense of Israel's historic place of dwelling. The passage is somewhat problematic because of a variation in one verse. The idea of the land as the concrete, historical dwelling place is present in both however. The passage according to the text used in the Revised Standard Version is as follows (1:35, 38-40):

> I will give your houses to a people that will come who without having heard me will believe. Those to whom I have shown no signs will do what I have commanded...And now, father, look with pride and see the people coming from the east; to them I will give as leaders Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and Hosea and Amos and Micah and Joel and Obadiah and Jonah and Nahum and Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, who is also called the messenger of the Lord.

One of the promises Ezra is specifically commissioned to make to the Church is the promise of the kingdom which was Israel's. That this kingdom is to be understood in respect to the land in its territorial significance is enhanced by the very Jewish terminology associated with the word "kingdom." In 2:10, the Church is promised the kingdom of

Jerusalem:

> Thus says the Lord to Ezra: 'Tell my people that I will give them the kingdom of Jerusalem, which I was going to give to Israel.'

It is very probable that the promised kingdom is meant to be understood as organically connected with the kingdom of God in the period of the Old Covenant: the Church was elected to fulfill and conclude the full number of Zion (2:40 ff.). Little effort is made to distinguish a new, spiritual or heavenly Jerusalem, Zion or kingdom from the old. The idea presented is similar to that in Romans eleven. The Church together with the saints of the Old Covenant would inherit the dominion of the kingdom of Israel (1:35, 2:10, 35, 40). It is true that the ultimate destiny of the Church is a heavenly kingdom in the New Age (2:37). It is here that the elect would experience the Paradise of God in which there would be neither toil nor weariness (2:12).[28] This is the kingdom already prepared for the Church (2:13). Yet, it must be noted that this kingdom is the one that God was going to give to national Israel, the everlasting habitation which had been prepared for Israel (2:10-11; cf. 1:35-40). As in Revelation, in Fourth Ezra the kingdom of God has its roots in the historic reality of the Old Covenant theocracy -- the kingdom of Jerusalem.

It is probable that the Davidic tradition of the victorious reign of the saints with Christ is also reflected. It is related that the saints who have confessed the name of God and have been preserved through "the day of tribulation and anguish" would receive glorious garments, crowns, and palms from the Lord (2:27, 31-48; cf. Revelation 3:5; 2:11; 7:9). Care is taken to indicate that Christ is uniquely greater in glory than the elect (2:43, 46-47). It is likely that the same beliefs expressed in Revelation concerning the reign did not always accompany the doctrine of the temporary messianic age. It is thus reflected in some parts of the New Testament:

---

[28] Cf. Fourth Ezra 8:52. The Aramaic version reads "true paradise" in 8:52. This may represent an older expression "now known from the Qumran Enoch fragments." Michael Stone, "Some Remarks on the Textual Criticism of IV Ezra," Harvard Theological Review, 60, 1967, p. 113.

> Already you are filled! Already you have become rich! Without us you have become kings! And would that you did reign, so that we might share the rule with you! (1 Corinthians 4:8)
> If we endure, we shall also reign with him...
> (2 Timothy 2:12)

It may be that outside of the Asian influence, this belief was held by later Christians without any emphasis on the temporary kingdom.

One of the writings of the Library of Nag Hammadi which is apparently orthodox expresses the same belief. The Teachings of Silvanus (VII, 4), probably late second century or early third century, in the main stands in the tradition of Judaeo-Christian wisdom literature and emphasizes the rational control of the basic impulses in order to attain the Christian balance and please God. Its concern is not apocalyptic proper, as is the case in 2 Clement. It gives articulation to some apocalyptic concepts in order to bring into proper perspective the true goal of and direction of the Christian life. Although there is no other indication the author entertained a belief in a temporary messianic age, the tradition expressing the hope of the Christian's victorious reign with Christ is clearly put forward (91:25 ff.):

> Keep the holy commandments of Jesus Christ, and you will reign over every place on earth and will be honored by the angels and the archangels. Then you will acquire them as friends and fellow servants, and you will acquire places in [heaven above].[29]

It may be that a temporary or inaugural messianic age is to be understood in this passage. Yet, as in other Syrian and Eastern literature already reviewed, a temporary kingdom is not clearly marked off and set apart as such.

In Fourth Ezra 1-2 most of the traditions associated with the concept of the land are used to signify the apocalyptic hopes of the redeemed. The New Age is viewed through the Jewish perspective of the historical promises and images. "Heaven" is pictured in terms of

---

[29] Nag Hammadi Library, ed. Robinson, p. 350. The brackets indicate a lacuna in the manuscript.

Canaan and Paradise -- concepts cherished by the saints of the Old Covenant.

CHAPTER 4

THE WEST

AN INTRODUCTION TO JUSTIN: AN EXPLANATION WHY THE LAND THEME IS ABSENT IN HIS APOLOGETIC LITERATURE AND THE APOLOGIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY

Justin, martyr and philosopher, was perhaps the most important Greek apologist of the second century.[1] In neither one of the apologies does the land promise theme emerge. Nor is this apocalyptic hope brought forward at his trial before the prefect Rusticus.[2] It is important therefore to devote a brief discussion concerning the reasons for these apologies and the reason why the land promise theme is not present in the apologetic literature of the second century generally.[3]

The proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ was largely unhindered by the Roman government for several generations. This was in part due to the fact that early Jewish Christians were regarded as a Jewish group. These Jewish Christians therefore enjoyed the relative religious toleration of the Roman Government. There is in fact no indication that Jesus had intended to found a new religion distinct from historic Israel. As Massey Shepherd has pointed out -- excepting the particular activity of Paul's confrontation with the Jews which is evident in Paul's letters -- as late as A.D. 52 and 58 (Acts 18:15; 28:21) it was not yet general knowledge that Christians were something other than another sect of Judaism.[4]

---

[1] Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 196; Willis, History of Christian Thought, pp. 81-82; Willis A. Shotwell, The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr, London: SPCK, 1965, p. 1 (hereafter cited as Exegesis of Justin Martyr).

[2] E. C. E. Owen, Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs, London: SPCK, 1933, pp. 47-52.

[3] Cf. Eric Francis Osborn, Justin Martyr, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 47, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973, pp. 171-172.

[4] Shepherd, "The Occasion of the Initial Break between Judaism and Christianity," in Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume, Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965, p. 704 (hereafter cited as "Break between Judaism and Christianity").

Persecution of the Church began with the Jews and was later continued by the Roman government. At first, Christians suffered from time to time through the instigation of the Jews, primarily the Sadducees according to Acts (Acts 4:1, 6; 5:17). The Christians were not excommunicated from Judaism however. As A. N. Sherwin-White asserted, it is almost certain the jurisdiction of the Jewish Sanhedrin did not extend to the death penalty during the first century (at least not at the time of Stephen's martyrdom.[5] It is probable that the execution of Stephen was not even preceded by a formal sentence of judgment by the Sanhedrin. The martyrdom of Saint Stephen has been therefore widely interpreted as a lynching.[6] As Shepherd has suggested, Jewish riots and tensions in Alexandria (ca. A.D. 38) and Palestine may have influenced the by then mentally unbalanced Caligula to order the erection of his own statue in the Temple of Jerusalem (ca. A.D. 41).[7] In light of the apocalyptic traditions preserved in Mark 13, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Christians may have interpreted this action of Caligula as an event signifying the imminent return of Christ. Increased attempts on the part of the Christians to win converts before the "End" may have strained their relationship with the Jews to a new extreme.[8] This may also have given "the Roman authorities their first indication that Christianity was a new religion."[9] This hypothesis may receive additional support if the proposition is true that the appellation of "Christians" was given by Roman authorities about this time.

---

[5] A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963, p. 38 (hereafter cited as Roman Society and Law in N.T.).

[6] Ibid., p. 40; cf. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "A Venture in the Source Analysis of Acts," in Munera Studiora, p. 94; Frederick J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931, pp. 69-70; Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, pp. 296-297.

[7] Shepherd, "Break between Judaism and Christianity," p. 715. Edward T. Salmon noted that Caligula, like his father before him, was anti-semitic: "It is significant that the Jewish communities were the only ones in the eastern Mediterranean which did not vote high-sounding honors to Germanicus and his family." A History of the Roman World from 30 B.C. to A.D. 138, 3rd ed., Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, vol. VI, London: Methuen and Company, 1959, p. 154, n. 1.

Further persecutions of some of the leading apostles by Herod Agrippa 1, who had been on good terms with Caligula, may have been influenced by this.[10] At any rate, as Shepherd made clear, the local persecution of the Christians by Nero in A.D. 64 demonstrated that by that time the Roman government clearly discerned Christianity as a religion distinct from Judaism (Tacitus, Annals 15:44.2-8).[11] After the martyrdom of James the Just (ca. A.D. 62), the disassociation of the Church with the First Jewish War (66-70), and the final excommunication of Christians from the synagogue (ca. 80-90), the separation of Judaism and Christianity was an established fact.[12]

Michael Grant has proposed that the Christian Gospels and Acts (cf. Romans 13; 1 Peter) were in part an attempt of the evangelists to demonstrate that Jesus and his diciples advocated obedience to the Roman government. The evangelists further sought to differentiate the beliefs and actions of the Christians from that of the Jews in this respect (cf. Mark 12:13-17; Matthew 26:52; Luke 17:21; John 8:44-45). Grant indicated that there was a great deal of Jewish precedence for this effort.[13]

---

[8] Shepherd, "Break between Judaism and Christianity," p. 716.

[9] Ibid., p. 717

[10] Ibid., p 712; cf. Michael Grant, Jews in the Roman World, p. 181.

[11] Shepherd, "Break between Judaism and Christianity," p. 704; cf. Michael Grant, Jews in the Roman World, pp. 171-182.

[12] The recent proposition of Michael Grant that some of the Judaeo-Christians sided with the Jewish rebels in the First Jewish War is pure conjecture. Jews in the Roman World, p. 210.

[13] Ibid., pp 211-224.

Henry Cadbury is in substantial agreement with this view.[14] Further, he indicated that the admission of the Gentiles into the essentially Jewish Church was another concern of the author of Luke-Acts. He proposed that Luke-Acts may be seen as a kind of apology in which one purpose was "to counter the possible hostility from the Roman government" once Christianity was recognized as a *religio illicita* no longer sheltered by its mother religion, Judaism.[15] Further, Acts endeavored to vindicate the admission of Gentiles into the covenant people of God and criticized the Jews who refused to recognize Jesus as their promised Messiah.[16] This very subject may have been involved in the actions of Herod Agrippa 1 against Peter and James. As Sherwin-White is careful to point out, a bias against the Jews may be reflected in some of the sources of Acts.[17] Whatever apologetic motifs may be reflected in the Gospels, Acts, Romans, and 1 Peter, they were not successful in deterring the Roman government from persecuting the Church.

Certainly, other Jewish and Christian literature at this time advocated the overthrow of the Roman Empire and the physical establishment of the Kingdom of God: Revelation, the Jewish 4 Ezra (3-14), the Christian 4 Ezra (1-2), and others.[18] Persecutions of the Church by the Roman government persisted to a greater or lesser degree from the reign of Domitian to that of Marcus Aurelius.[19]

---

[14] Henry Cadbury, "Acts of the Apostles," *IDB*, vol. 1, p. 39, sec. 10, b.

[15] Ibid., p. 37, sec. 9.

[16] Ibid., p. 38.

[17] Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Law in N.T.*, p. 40; cf. Michael Grant, *Jews in the Roman World*, pp. 218-219.

[18] Cf. W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution*, pp. 190-191.

[19] Ibid., pp.1-302.

The situation of the Church during our period of study was a precarious one.[20] As L. W. Barnard has stated, in some areas Christians were in constant danger of denunciation by an informer (cf. Pliny, Letters, X.96).[21] Individual anxiety may have been sufficiently overwhelming in some cases, so that certain Christians abandoned the faith. Popular misconceptions had associated with Christianity practices of immorality and a general hatred of mankind. The accusation of atheism and the charge of treason were related to the Church's failure to sacrifice to the state gods.[22] The apologists were concerned therefore primarily with a proper understanding of Christianity and its position in the eyes of the Roman government: Christians were moral and loyal subjects and should be treated on a parity with the rest of the populace of the empire (Justin's Apology i.3-12).[23]

Justin indicated that some ancient pagans such as Socrates were also charged with atheism and put to death. Although the full manifestation of the Logos had not yet occurred in the incarnation of Christ, these enlightened pagans had a grasp of the concept of the Logos in some sense and therefore refused to submit to idolatry. The satanic powers earlier deceived those in authoritative positions so that these quasi-Christians -- those who believed in the Logos -- were persecuted. In the same way Satan has deceived the Roman authorities to persecute Christians and deceived mankind about the true philosophy of Christianity (cf. Apology i.14, 21, 22; Apology ii.7; Dialogue with Trypho 1-9 and 35).

---

[20] Daniélou believed that persecution was "the outstanding characteristic" of Christianity at this time. A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicea (Volume Two): Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, trans. John Austin Baker, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1973, p. 8 (hereafter cited as Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture).

[21] L. W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought, Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967, p. 2 (hereafter cited as Justin Martyr).

[22] Philip Carrington, Christian Apologetics of the Second Century in Relation to Modern Thought, London and New York: SPCK and the Macmillan Company, 1921, pp. 15-17.

[23] Cf. Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, pp. 186-188; Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, p. 7; Erwin R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr, Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchlandlung (Walter Biedermann), 1923, pp. 80 ff. (hereafter cited as Theology of Justin Martyr).

Daniélou has argued that the second century Christian apologies, among other things, were a kind of missionary literature designed for the public (Justin, Apology ii.15). Daniélou pointed to three different precedents for this missionary motif: 1) the apologies of Hellenistic Judaism such as the Letter of Aristeas, Josephus' Against Apion, and Philo's Concerning the Life of Moses and Concerning the Decalogue, among others;[24] 2) the early Christian missionary preaching, especially Paul's, and 3) Aristotle's Protrepticus.[25] In addition to these sources Barnard indicated that the brilliant defense of Socrates "in which he showed the essential rationality of his position" may have influenced the apologists.[26]

According to Daniélou, the apologies served another useful function. They contained catechetical material for the purpose of instructing converts preparing for baptism. Justin's "presentation of Christian morality recalls many features of the Jewish-Christian catecheses in the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas."[27] Although it is probable that the phrases of Justin are closer to the language of the New Covenant scriptures, the particular element of praying and fasting -- (Justin adds for the remission of sins) -- is evident (cf. Didache 7:4; Apology i.61-62). If the practice reflected the Jewish notion of purification from sin and demonic influence (cf. Matthew 17:21), then the Epistle of Barnabas may also reflect this idea (16:7 ff.). The catechetical motif is evident elsewhere in Justin's Apology i.13, 14-20, 61-67.

---

[24] Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, p. 10. Others that may be mentioned are Philo's Legation to Gaius and Against Flaccus, and perhaps 4 Maccabees.

[25] See Excursus 2 below on Aristotle's Protrepticus.

[26] Barnard, Justin Martyr, p. 3.

[27] Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, p. 29; cf. Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, p 320.

The second century apologies did not necessarily include everything their authors believed concerning important themes of Christian doctrine. Christian beliefs concerning the eventual victorious reign of the saints would hardly be a discreet element in an apology. In this respect, Massey Shepherd's statement is succinct and to the point:

> The Christian expectation of the imminent end of the world when Christ would come in glory to establish God's kingdom appeared treasonable, to say the least.[28]

EXCURSUS 2: THE INFLUENCE OF ARISTOTLE'S PROTREPTICUS

Daniélou is highly speculative when he asserts that "a number of recent studies have proved that the Protrepticus has left its mark on the writings of the Apologists."[29] It is true that the conclusions of rather recent studies favor Daniélou's position to a point.[30] Nevertheless, no scholar has convincingly overthrown Wilson Gerson Rabinowitz's rather negative conclusion which discredits Daniélou's position.[31]

---

[28] Shepherd,"The Rise of Christianity," in A Short History of Christianity, p. 18 (hereafter cited as "Rise of Christianity"); cf. L. W. Barnard, "Justin Martyr's Eschatology," Vigiliae Christianae, 19, 1965, p. 94.

[29] Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, p. 11.

[30] Albin Lesky, A History of Greek Literature, 2d ed., trans. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer, New York: Thomas T. Crowell Company, 1963, pp. 553-555; Ingemar Düring, Aristotle's Protrepticus: An Attempt at Reconstruction, Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, XII Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckein Aktiebolag, 1961, pp. 11-39, 269-286 (hereafter cited as Aristotle's Protrepticus). Although Anton-Hermann Chroust often disagreed with Düring, he expressed that Düring presented the most remarkable argument in detail in respect to the reconstruction of the Protrepticus. Aristotle: Protrepticus, A Reconstruction, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964, pp. v-vi and ix-xix. Cf. Niels Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum: Ein Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins, Acta Theolgica Danica, vol. 9, Copenhagen: Prostant apud Munksgoard, 1966, p. 120, n. 10 (hereafter cited as Philosophie und Christentum).

[31] W. G. Rabinowitz, Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of Its Reconstruction, University of California Publications, vol. 16, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957, pp. 1-2, 93-95 (hereafter cited as Aristotle's Protrepticus and Sources).

Düring admits the sound and good argument of Rabinowitz in respect to the first five groups of the "fragments" of the Protrepticus and his criticism of several earlier "ill-founded" hypotheses.[32] In fact, he believed that Rabinowitz's book "contains many acute observations and many results of lasting value."[33] Düring's main reason for rejecting Rabinowitz's thesis seems to have been Rabinowitz's general critical attitude.[34]

It should be noted that Daniélou as well as Lesky indicate that imitations of Aristotle's Protrepticus such as Cicero's Hortensius, may have influenced the Christian apologists.[35] Yet the assumption that Cicero used Aristotle's Protrepticus rests on dubious grounds.[36]

In respect to Daniélou's proposition that Aristotle's Protrepticus was the third major influence on Christian apologetic literature of the second century, a significant portion of Rabinowitz's work deserves quoting:

> A prediction might be ventured that a painstaking study of those portions of the 'excerpts' which have not been subjected to analysis in the preceding chapter will reveal therein a complex array of doctrines derived from many sources, and, further, that when such a study has been fully carried out, the last ground for the erroneous notion of an 'excerpt' -- our ignorance of Iamblichus' actual sources -- will have been removed. Only then will the unjustifiable ascription of passages from near and far to the lost Protrepticus be checked; and only then will the true poverty of our information

---

[32] Düring, Aristotle's Protrepticus, pp. 11-13.

[33] Ibid., p. 14.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, p. 10; Lesky, A History of Greek Literature, p. 555.

[36] Rabinowitz, Aristotle's Protrepticus and Sources, pp. 23-26.

> concerning the work be realized...But so far as we can see at present, we shall not know, or be deluded into thinking that we know, when the work was written, what its form, its length, its contents, its purpose and significance were, what its relation to Platonism, Isocrateanism, Epicureanism, and early Christian thought was.
> These conclusions are negative. They are not for that reason unnecessary. What is important is whether they are true, and they have been put forward in the belief that recognition of ignorance, where more than ignorance is impossible of achievement, is itself an advance in knowledge.[37]

If the conclusion of Rabinowitz is correct, then the main influences on the writings of the second century Christian apologies were the earlier Jewish apologetic works, the Old Covenant scriptures, and the early Jewish Christian missionary preaching.[38]

It is important for this study to keep in mind the strong Jewish influence on the Church -- even in the apologetic literature -- during the second century.[39] "We may speak therefore of a Christianity of Hellenism but hardly of a Hellenization of Christianity, particularly if we attempt to appreciate as a whole the intellectual development of the Apologists."[40] Attempts to overemphasize the non-Jewish Hellenistic elements in these second century Christian defenses of the faith create an artificial barrier between the beliefs -- often very Jewish in their _Verbindung_ and _Begriff_ in respect to the Old Covenant promises about Christ and his believers. This is very important in realizing the realities of Judaism which the apologist Justin applies to the Church in his _Dialogue with Trypho_.

---

[37] Ibid., p. 95.

[38] Cf. Shepherd, "Rise of Christianity," p. 21; Barnard, _Justin Martyr_, p. 3.

[39] Shotwell, _Exegesis of Justin Martyr_, pp. 114 ff.

[40] Quasten, _Patrology_, vol. 1, pp. 187-188.

CHAPTER 5

THE WEST

JUSTIN'S DIALOGUE WITH TRYPHO

Justin's Dialogue with Trypho may be divided into four principal sections:[1] 1) a prologue (chapters 1-9) which may be incomplete;[2] 2) Justin's understanding of the purpose of the Mosaic Law (chapters 10-30 or possibly 31); a section which advances Justin's reasons for believing Christ is the promised Son of God (31-118); and a section emphasizing the fact that the Church is the true Israel and heir of the historic promises (109-142). It should be noted that almost all the traditions associated with the promise of blessing in the land as an apocalyptic hope of the Church are clearly affirmed in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. A comprehensive discussion of all of these traditions would require a separate study. We shall attempt therefore to highlight the various traditions.

A few matters should receive some attention before proceeding with an exposition of the land promise theme in the Dialogue with Trypho. Several remarks of Johannes Quasten indicate the reason this is necessary:

> The Dialogue with Trypho is the oldest Christian apology against the Jews which is extant. Unfortunately we do not have its complete text. The introduction, and a large part of Chapter 74, have been lost. The Dialogue must have been composed after the Apologies, because there is a reference to the first Apology in Chapter 120. It contains a two-day discussion with a learned Jew, most likely the very Rabbi Tarphon that

---

[1] Theodore Stylianopoulos, Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law, Dissertation Series, no. 20, Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975, p. 7, n. 3 (hereafter cited as Justin and Law). In this chapter the Dialogue with Trypho will often be referred to as the Dialogue.

[2] J. C. M. Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine, Philosophia Patrum, vol. 1, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, p. 21 (hereafter cited as An Early Christian Philosopher). The Greek text used for the Dialogue with Trypho is that of Van Winden in the volume just noted. Otherwise the annotated translation used for the Dialogue with Trypho is the following: A. Lukyn Williams, Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho, London and New York: SPCK and the Macmillan Company, 1930 (hereafter cited as Dialogue with Trypho). Williams used the following edition: Edgar J. Goodspeed, Die ältesten

> is mentioned in the Mishna. Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 4, 18, 6) held Ephesus as the place where this conversation was held. St. Justin dedicated his work to a certain Marcus Pompeius.[3]

Except for the statement concerning the date of the composition of the Dialogue with Trypho,[4] all the other remarks are widely disputed: To whom is the Dialogue with Trypho addressed -- or for whom is it intended? Is it a pure literary fiction or is it in fact based on an actual two day discussion with a Jew? Who is Trypho? It is doubtful he was Rabbi Tarphon. Where did the Dialogue take place -- Corinth as Niels Hyldahl persuasively argues,[5] or Ephesus according to the tradition preserved in Eusebius' Church History iv.18.6? What is the purpose of the introduction? What is the significance of Justin's wearing the enigmatic philosopher's cloak -- whether historical or dramatic in its intended use?

The question concerning the addressees of the Dialogue has received various and conflicting answers. A. Lukyn Williams, Johannes Quasten, Willis A. Shotwell, L. W. Barnard, and Theolore Stylianopoulos to a greater or lesser extent argue that the Dialogue is intended for Jews. Altaner-Stuiber seem to favor this view but do not make explicit their position.[6] The main reasons presented for this position are: 1) Justin's remarkable knowledge of post-biblical Judaism, demonstrated in the Dialogue.[7] 2) Justin's knowledge of the variety of Jewish-Christian groups in his time (Dialogue with Trypho 8:2-4; 47:1-4);[8] and

---

Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1914, pp. 90-265.

[3] Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, pp. 202-203.

[4] Goodenough, Theology of Justin Martyr, pp. 87 ff.; Barnard, Justin Martyr, p. 22.

[5] Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, pp. 95-97.

[6] Williams, Dialogue with Trypho, pp. xix ff.; Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 203; Shotwell, Exegesis of Justin Martyr, pp. 2 ff.; Barnard Justin Martyr, pp. 21-26; Stylianopoulos, Justin and Law, p. 195; Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 67.

[7] Cf. Williams, Dialogue with Trypho, pp. xxx-xxxiv; Shotwell, Exegesis of Justin Martyr, pp. 83 ff.

[8] Unless otherwise indicated all references are to Justin's Dialogue with Trypho.

3) Justin's belief that there are a number of national Jews yet to be converted before the return of Christ and the Consummation (25.1; 32.2; 39:1-2; possibly 55:3; and 64:2-3). Perhaps the best support for this third point is found in 39:1-2, a passage discussing the time of Elijah:

> Just therefore as God did not at that time bring His wrath upon them, for the sake of those seven thousand, so now also He has not yet brought the Judgment, nor has begun to bring it, because He knows that every day some are becoming disciples unto the name of His Christ, and are leaving the way of error, who also receive gifts, each as they are worthy of them, being enlightened by the name of this Christ...[9]

Although this thought is expressed in the first Apology (28; 45) and is intended primarily for pagans, the context of the Dialogue 39:1-2 almost certainly indicates that the remnant to be converted are national Jews.

Other scholars such as Erwin R. Goodenough and Niels Hyldahl argue that the intended readers were pagans. The principle reasons given to support the pagan-addressee hypothesis are: 1) the name of the addressee is a Roman name, Marcus Pompeius (Dialogue 8:3; 14:5); 2) frequent and specific references to gentiles in a manner that would suggest them as the intended addressees (23:3; 24:3; 29:1; 32:5 and others); 3) the philosophical tone of the prologue and the presentation of Christianity as a philosophy (1-9); and 4) the literary form of the Dialogue itself.[10]

A third position concerning the addressees of the Dialogue has been presented recently by Jon Nilson. His hypothesis is that the Dialogue is addressed primarily to pagans who are inclined to convert to either Judaism or Christianity.[11] Further, according to Nilson, the Dialogue is an endeavor to demonstrate the differences between Judaism and Christianity; by a conversion to Judaism one would become a member of a religion which was meant to be supplanted by Christianity.[12]

---

[9] On the delay of the judgment see Barnard, Justin Martyr, pp. 160-163.

[10] Goodenough, Theology of Justin Martyr, pp. 88-100; Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, pp. 16-22.

[11] Jon Nilson, "To Whom is Justin's Dialogue with Trypho Addressed?" Theological Studies, 38, 1977, p. 539 (hereafter cited as "To Whom is Justin's Dialogue Addressed?").

[12] Ibid.

Nilson offers many of the arguments already mentioned in respect to the "pagan-hypothesis" above. Two additional arguments do not seem convincing to the present writer. Nilson argues that Justin's use of the LXX is quite understandable if a Gentile audience is in view.[13] Would this not be equally true of Jews of the Dispersion? Another reason presented by Nilson is that according to Eusebius (Ecclesiastical History 4:18) the "purpose [of the Dialogue] was to refute 'ugly rumors' which were accepted and repeated by 'those who do not know us.'"[14] It is not impossible that the rumors were spread by Jewish authorities such as the Rabbis who warned Jews against entering (theological?) discussions with Christians (Dialogue 38:1; cf. Acts 13:51; 2 Peter 3:17; 1 Timothy 6:20). It is quite possible therefore, that the Dialogue was intended to clarify Christianity for Jews, and not simply for pagans.[15]

The question of whether the Dialogue reflects an historical discussion or is put forward as a literary form is much debated. In addition to the scholars who favor pagans as the intended addressees, Nilson and Van Winden consider the Dialogue a literary fiction.[16] Quasten is a good example of the opposite view. Barnard advanced the proposition that:

> The best solution to the literary problem of the Dialogue is to postulate an original, historical debate with Trypho which occurred soon after A.D. 132, which Justin subsequently elaborated c.A.D. 160, drawing on oral and written testimony material which was known and used in the Church of his day.[17]

---

[13] Ibid., p. 542.

[14] Ibid., p. 545.

[15] It ought to be noted that Harry J. Leon supports one of Nilson's principle assumptions in respect to Jewish proselytism. Jews of Ancient Rome, pp. 250-256.

[16] Nilson, "To Whom is Justin's Dialogue Addressed?," p. 540; Van Winden, Early Christian Philosopher, p. 127.

[17] Barnard, Justin Martyr, pp. 23-24.

The arguments of Stylianopoulos and Altaner-Stuiber would seem to favor Barnard's position.[18]

In contrast to the view of Quasten, the majority of scholars reject the identification of Trypho with Rabbi Tarphon. Trypho includes himself among those warned by their teachers not to converse with Justin (Dialogue 38:1). Both Williams and Hyldahl point out the commonness of the name Trypho, and reject Trypho's identification with Rabbi Tarphon, who Williams believed died around A.D. 120.[19] The evidence in fact, is insufficient either to prove or disprove that the discussion with Trypho was a real discussion with Rabbi Tarphon -- reworked of course -- or with a Trypho whom Justin created possibly to represent the famous Rabbi Tarphon.

For some reason Hyldahl wants to fix the place of the Dialogue in Corinth. The passage in question is part of Dialogue 1:3. The Greek seems clear enough:

> Τρύφων, φησί, καλοῦμαι · εἰμὶ δὲ Ἑβραῖος ἐκ
> περιτομῆς, φγῶν τὸν νῦν γενόμενον πόλεμον,
> ἐν τῆ Ἑλλάδι καὶ τῆ Κορίνθῳ τὰ πολλὰ διάγων.

Hyldahl translated the passage with a phrase that gives a rather strong adverbial force to the word καί:

> 'Ich heisse Tryphon', spricht er; 'ich bin Hebräer aus der Beschneidung; als Flüchtling auf Grund des kürzlich stattgefundenen Krieges halte ich mich jetzt meistens in Griechenland auf und zwar hier in Korinth'.[20]

He then commented on this passage in reference to Justin's intended departure by sea and concluded that Trypho was intending to set sail for

---

[18] Stylianopoulos, Justin and Law, pp. 165-168 and 194; Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 67.

[19] Williams, Dialogues with Trypho, p. 2, n. 2; Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, p. 96. Arthur Cushman McGiffert was careful to point out that "of Trypho, whom, Eusebius characterizes as 'a most distinguished man among the Hebrews,' we know nothing beyond what we can gather from the dialogue itself." Church History, p. 196, n. 7.

[20] Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, p. 95.

Ephesus.[21] There is no need however to translate and interpret this passage in this manner. William's translation is, the present writer believes, better:

> I am called Trypho, he said, and I am a circumcised Hebrew, who have fled from the war which broke out recently, and am spending much time in Greece and in Corinth.[22]

Hyldahl's translation is not impossible by any means. If *Dialogue* 142:1 clearly indicated Justin was returning by sea to Ephesus it would be an insightful (but unnecessary) translation. It is quite possible, however, as Williams pointed out, that Justin is setting sail for Rome.[23] At any rate, Hyldahl cannot prove from the Greek that the discussion was supposed to have taken place "zwar heir in Korinth."

Daniélou suggested that by means of the λόγος Justin was indicating "a continuity between the sages of Greece and the Christians."[24] This may have been Justin's method in the *Apologies* to reflect Christianity in terms pagans could comprehend.[25] Van Winden makes a careful distinction, however, concerning Justin's concept of Christianity's supposed continuity with Greek philosophy which is useful in our approach to Justin's Dialogue.[26]

---

[21] Ibid., p. 97.

[22] Williams, *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 2. Two reasons favor Williams' translation. The first is the circumstantial participle διαγῶν. The circumstantial participle, which is used without an article, qualifies the main verb (ειμὶ) like a supplementary predicate in relations implying time, means, manner, cause, purpose, etc. (Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, pp. 456-457, 465-466.) Although it is impossible to be absolutely certain in respect to its manner of qualification, here the qualification of time would be inferred from the context. It would even allow Trypho to be back in Epheus (for some unknown reason) because the phrase τὸν νῦν γενόμενον πόλεμον could mean the war which "has recently taken place" and not "was just now beginning to take place." (Cf. Margaret E. Thall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*, New Testament Tools and Studies, vol. 3, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1962, pp. 30-34.)

The second reason is the probable copulative conjunctional force of καί because of its use with the adjective πολῦς in the plural. Adjectives of quantity in the plural are usually joined by a καί or τέ καί in a simple copulative conjunctional sense. (Cf.Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, pp. 650-652.

[23] Williams, *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. x.

[24] Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, p. 33.

The dramatic element of the cloak and the prologue in which Justin outlines his quest for truth through investigating the various philosophical schools may have been intended "to bring the problem of philosophy to the fore."[27] Van Winden picks up on an observation of Henry Chadwick in respect to the wearing of the philosopher's cloak and relates this dramatic element to the purpose of both the prologue and the Dialogue.[28] He proposed that the cloak indicates a continuity not between Greek philosophy and Christianity but between the primordial philosophy and Christianity.[29] He, in part, has probably made an important and judicious criticism of Hyldahl in this respect.

Hyldahl, in discussing Dialogue 2:1-2, recognized that Justin believed "Das Christentum is daher die wiedergefundene Urphilosophie!"[30] Further, he interpreted Justin to mean the primordial (true) philosophy was sent down to everyone and not just in the content of the Old Covenant revelation.[31] Van Winden, however, pointed to Dialogue 7:1 in which it explicitly says that only by the prophets who preceded the philosophers was the primordial philosophy properly understood (οὗτοι μόνοι).[32] It would seem therefore that Hyldahl missed a subtle point: the primordial philosophy was sent down to all men but it was only the prophets who [correctly] saw (εῖδον) and declared it [the primordial philosophic truth -- probably in respect to the Logos] to mankind. And this brings us to a final important point before our exegesis of the land-promise theme in the Dialogue with Trypho.

---

[25] Cf. Shotwell, Exegesis of Justin Martyr, pp. 115-117.

[26] Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher p. 24.

[27] Ibid., p. 23.

[28] Ibid., p. 24; cf. Henry Chadwick, The Early Church, The Pelican History of the Church, vol. 1, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969, p. 75.

[29] Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher, p. 112.

[30] Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, p. 234 (cf. pp. 214 ff.).

[31] Ibid., p. 234.

[32] Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher, p. 112.

Van Winden deserves special merit for integrating the prologue of the philosophical discussion into the Dialogue which from chapter ten on is emphatically concerned with the realities of the Old Covenant promises, the Law, Christ, and the apocalyptic hope of the new Israel. Van Winden's point should be viewed in light of the following texts: Dialogue 2:1-2; 7:1; 35:6. Just as the one true primordial philosophy was sent down to all men and only the prophets correctly understood the truth, so Christ was sent down to men and only (orthodox) Christians understood him and declare him to mankind. Van Winden's analogy is as follows:[33]

Philosophy	Christianity
one science	one faith
various schools	various sects or heresies
adherents named after	adherents named after
the 'father of the doctrine'	the 'father of the doctrine'
(πατὴρ τοῦ λόγον)	(ἀρχηγέτης τῆς γνῶμης)
they call themselves philosophers	they call themselves Christians
but are not	but are not

Hence, the philosophical prologue is a proper introduction to a work intended for Jews and Christians -- a work which in the catholic view of Justin would also have pagans in mind: In the words of Willis Shotwell, "when used with the key of christocentric interpretation, the methods of the rabbis were the best method for interpreting Scripture. This then, was true philosophy -- the love and explication of the Prophets and all Scriptures were prophetic."[34] It is through the perspective of the true philosophy, Christianity, that God's revelation to man can be understood and declared -- and this is true especially of God's promises in the Old Covenant scriptures.

---

[33] Van Winden, Ibid., p. 43.

[34] Shotwell, Exegesis of Justin Martyr, p. 117. Charles M. Nielsen expressed a similar evaluation of Justin in his discussion of Judaism and Marcion. "The Epistle to Diognetus: Its Date and Relationship to Marcion." Anglican Theological Review, 52, 1970, p. 79.

EXEGESIS

The Dialogue with Trypho reflects almost all of the traditions associated with the promise of blessing in the land as an apocalyptic goal of God's people. The Church is the new Israel, continuous with the old, and as such heir to the promised inheritance. In this assertion, Justin makes use of the Pauline argument found in Galatians chapter 3-4. The Abrahamic (patriarchal), Mosaic, and Davidic traditions are clearly recalled and expected in an apocalyptic fulfillment. Further, these three principal traditions are brought together in Christ and emerge as an even brighter ray of hope for the people of God.

Specific mention is made of the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the thousand years reign of the victorious saints as taught in John's Revelation. Allusion is made to the concept of Paradise by means of the tree of life. As in most of the literature from the time of the earlier New Covenant books which affirm the land-promise theme as an apocalyptic hope, the Temple is discussed in purely historical terms. Further, Justin sees the fulfillment of the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah in which the nations from afar are brought to the one true God because of the word of the Lord which goes forth from Zion and Jerusalem. In other words, in the understanding of Justin, the great Isaian expectations of the glorious future of the restored Davidic kingdom precede the conversion of the Gentiles (cf. Micah 4:1-2; Isaiah 2:2-3).

TRUE ISRAEL; ABRAHAMIC TRADITION; INHERITANCE

The idea that the Church is the true Israel and continuous with the saints of the Old Covenant is a major theme which runs throughout the Dialogue (11:4-5; 32:5; 39; 1 ff.; 43:2 ff.; and especially 119-135). As Stylianopolous has remarked, this theme seems to be "present whenever the 'we/you' [we=the Church, you=the nation of Israel] contrast" is emphasized.[35] Eric Francis Osborn pointed out "that the cognate idea of inheritance is used with that of Israel" in the sense of the true Israel of both the Old and New Covenants.[36] To the observations of Stylianopoulos and Osborn may be added a third. Justin endeavored to explain the concept of the Church as the new Israel not only in respect to a continuity with the true, believing Old Covenant saints but also in terms of God's rejection of the unbelieving part of national Israel.

---

[35] Stylianopoulos, Justin and Law, p. 179, n. 35.

Justin explains that God has rejected national Israel (119:1-2) and that the Church is now continuous with the saints of the Old Covenant and now is to be identified as the new Israel (119:4-5; 120:1-2 cf. 24:4). The Church is not a mere proselyte-Israel, but the new Israel with a new law and a New Covenant (122:1-6; 123:1; 122:5 ff.).[37] Justin used the passage in Ezekiel 36:12 to make the point (123:6).

Trypho's negative and bewildered response to Justin's ideas are reflected in Dialogue 38:1; 73:5; 79:1. One which in its succinctness is appropriate to quote (39:3):

> At this Trypho said to me: I would have you know that you are out of your mind when you say all this.

In respect to the particular point of the Church inheriting the promised land, Trypho inquires, "are you [the Church] Israel (123:7)." Justin replies that this is the case and God has apportioned to the Church the same inheritance and the same nomenclature of true historic Israel (123:6-9; cf. 135:3). Earlier, Justin made reference to both the Abrahamic and Mosaic traditions by stating that some Jews, as the children of Abraham, wished to inherit a part of the holy land (25:1). Because the majority of national Israel disobeyed the stipulations of the

---

[36] Osborn, Justin Martyr, p. 178; Pelikan, Emergence of Catholic Tradition, p. 26; cf. the statement of Ben Zion Bokser that Justin appropriates for the Church the inheritance of national Israel -- including the holy land. "Justin Martyr and the Jews," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 64, 1973-1974, p. 208.

[37] Pelikan, Emergence of Catholic Tradition, pp. 14-27; cf. Neal M. Flanagan's discussion of Christianity and Judaism in respect to Paul, Salvation History: An Introduction to Biblical Theology, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964, pp. 221 and 226.

Mosaic law, national Israel lost the land (16:1; 21:1-2). Trypho understood Justin to mean that none of national Israel would receive anything in the "holy mountain of God" (25.6). Justin however, points out that all those who believe in Christ will inherit the promised land. Further, it is necessary that circumcision of the heart, not of the flesh, must take place; and obedience to the Old Covenant scriptures must be done through the perspective of Christ (23:5; 26; 1; 28:2; 29:2).

Justin offers several examples of God's historic and continuing discretion in this respect. One is the story of Isaiah being sawed in two (120:5; cf. 113:2). Another is that of Jacob's two wives which prefigured Israel (Leah) and the new Israel (Rachel) (134:3-6). In this respect, Osborn's remark is to the point:

> Justin's account of the new Israel is very simple. The race which is begotten by Israel is Israel. Christ is the true Israel and the race which comes from him in his begetting of sons of God is the new and spiritual Israel.[38]

Justin applies various scriptures to the promise that the Church will inherit the land (11:2-4; 119:1-122:6). Further, Justin makes use of the same argument of Paul in Galatians 3-4 in respect to inheritance in order specifically to conclude that the promise of blessing in the land is an apocalyptic hope of the Church (119:5). The clarity of Justin's meaning and his use of Paul's argument deserves noting (119:5):

> What more then does Christ here grant to Abraham? This, that by a similar calling He called Him with His voice, telling him to go forth from the land in which he was dwelling. And all of us also did He call by that voice, and we went forth from the state of life in which we were living, yea, and living evilly according to the common ways of all other inhabitants of the earth. And we shall inherit the Holy Land together with Abraham, receiving our inheritance for a boundless eternity, as being children of Abraham because we have like faith with him.

Justin also advances the proposition that the righteous who preceded the giving of the law or of circumcision are to be included in the people of God (44-46).

---

[38] Osborn, Justin Martyr, p. 177.

MOSAIC TRADITION

In addition to the reference to the conditional Mosaic tradition mentioned above, several other points are made in the Dialogue which clearly reflect the Mosaic tradition. Christ sums up and fulfills the law: Christ, in a sense, "is the Law" (12:2 ff.). It is through Christ that a new law and a New Covenant (11:2 ff.) guarantee that the believer will gain the promised inheritance. But the believer, as in Barnabas 9:4, must endure in his faith (18:3). In fact, because of the present state of Judaism, it is impossible to keep all the stipulations of the Mosaic law (46:2 ff.). Therefore the Jewish hope must be in Him who is the new, eternal law (12:2). Further, in respect to the Temple and the sacrificial system involved in the Mosaic tradition, Justin makes a rather bold assertion. He advances the argument that the Temple and the sacrifices were given to the Jews as concrete symbols so that the Jewish people would not fall into idolatry (19:2; 22:1-11). Williams' comment on this point is especially clear in summarizing Justin's argument concerning the real significance of circumcision and the sacrificial and ceremonial practices associated with the Temple:

> The fact that the saints before Abraham were uncircumcised shows that it is not necessary in itself....God gave circumcision as a means for distinguishing members of the Jewish nation from others, in fact as a racial sign....Very similar to this is J's further argument that sacrifices and dietary laws, and even the Temple itself, were really given to prevent the Jews from falling into idolatry, and therefore have no permanent value...[39]

In fact, the present writer agrees to some extent with one of the conclusions of Stylianopoulos concerning Justin's regard of the Old Covenant law:

> Justin remains within the older Christian tradition and insists on the radical abolishment of the Law by Christ. However, he seems to regard the Law as something ultimately indifferent for he allows Jewish Christians who live within the Church to

---

[39] Williams, Dialogue with Trypho, p. 38, n. 1; cf. Stephen's speech in Acts 7. For the attitude of the Ebionites' rejection of sacrifice see Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 56 ff.

> practice it (Dial. 47.2).[40]

Justin, expresses caution on this point (47:4):

> Now they that follow their advice, and live under the law, as well as keep their profession in the Christ of God, will, I suppose perhaps be saved.

It must be pointed out, moreover, that those Christians who still keep the Mosaic law as much as is possible under the current historical circumstances, will not receive the inheritance if they require other Christians to do the same (47:3). In the Dialogue, the Mosaic tradition and all of the practices associated with it have served a divine historical purpose in respect to the nation Israel, but has now been summed up and superseded by Christ.

DAVIDIC TRADITION

The Davidic tradition is also reflected throughout the Dialogue. Justin explains that the first advent of Christ was to suffer and to redeem the people by fulfilling the law. In his second advent, however, Christ will return as the glorious Davidic king. Psalm 110 and Isaiah 7:10-16, according to Justin, applies not to the former King Hezekiah but to Christ (83). Likewise, Justin believed Psalm 72:1 referred not to Solomon but to Christ. The cosmic reign of Christ over the nations and the adoration of the nations imply more than the kind of homage paid to Solomon (34:2; 36; 1 ff.; 64:3-8). One of the best summaries of Justin's belief in the contrast between the two advents is in Dialogue 14:8:

> Now of these and such-like words spoken by the prophets, Trypho, I said, some have been spoken with reference to the first coming of Christ, in which He has been proclaimed as about to appear both without honour and without form and mortal, but others have been spoken with reference to His second coming, when He will be present in glory and upon the clouds, and your people will see and will recognize Him whom they pierced, as Hosea, one of the Twelve Prophets, and Daniel foretold.

Williams believed Justin drew from Daniel (9:26) and mistakingly substituted Hosea for Zechariah (12.10).[41] It is possible, however, that

---

[40] Stylianopoulos, Justin and Law, p. 168.

[41] Williams, Dialogue with Trypho, p. 30, n. 3.

Justin also had in mind certain passages in Hosea which christocentrically could reflect the same statement made in Zechariah 12:10 (cf. Hosea 2:14-16; 6:1-2; 11:8-12; 14:1-7).

In the Dialogue, the glorious king has come in a certain spiritual sense. Just as Elijah had to come before the day of the Lord (cf. Malachi 4:5), Elijah has come in the form of John the Baptist (49:2-4; cf. Matthew 17.10 ff.). Therefore, the triumphal entry of Christ (53:1; 56; cf. Genesis 49:11; Zechariah 9:9) "was a foretelling of both the works which should be done by them at His first advent" (likewise of the Gentiles who should believe in him) and the fact that Jesus was the promised Davidic King (53:3-6; cf. Zechariah 9:9). The Church has recognized the significance of these prophesies and therefore Christ has truly become the light of the Gentiles.

Justin brings together the three principle traditions -- the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic -- and asserts that through Christ the new Israel is the recipient of the new circumcision, the new law, and a new kingship (43:1 ff.). Further, by means of the christocentric principle of interpretation, as Shotwell has previously pointed out, Justin understands the great prophecies concerning the promised Messiah and the glorious restoration of Jerusalem to have occurred already in a spiritual sense (cf. Malachi 4:5, Zechariah 9:9, Isaiah 7:16, Isaiah 2:2-3; Micah 4:1-2).[42] In a clear reference to the two Isaian passages (Isaiah 2:2-3; Micah 4:1-2), Justin believed that the conversion of the Gentiles has already followed the coming of the Messiah and the Zion from which the word of God would go forth to the nations (110:1-3). Because this passage illustrates how differently these two Isaian passages could be interpreted by an early orthodox Christian writer from that postulated by W. D. Davies, the passage will be quoted to the extent it demonstrates the specific point just mentioned (110:1-2):

---

[42] Cf. Shotwell, Exegesis of Justin Martyr, pp. 2-23, 29-32, 116-117; Pelikan, Emergence of Catholic Tradition, p. 19; Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, pp. 303-304.

> But they say that even if He has come it is not known who He is, but when He shall become manifest and glorious, then, so they affirm, will it be known who He is. And then, they say, will all that is spoken in this chapter come to pass, as though there were as yet no fruit at all come from the words of the prophecy. Most unreasonable men! For they do not understand what is shown by all these words, that two Advents of His have been announced; one in which He has been proclaimed as liable to suffering, and without glory, and without honour, and crucified; and the second in which He will come with glory from the heavens, when also the Man of the apostasy, who also speaketh strange things against the Most High, will dare to do lawless deeds on earth against us Christians. For we, who have come to know the true worship of God from the Law, and the Word that went forth from Jerusalem by the apostles of Jesus, have fled for refuge to Him who is God of Jacob and God of Israel.

In a spiritual sense, the word of the Lord went forth concerning true worship of God and the law from Jerusalem by the proclamation of the Lord and the true Israel (his apostles cf. especially Isaiah 2:3; Micah 4:2).

It is important here to note that in Justin's understanding of the order of prophetic events regarding the conversion of the Gentiles, the essence of Micah 4:2 and Isaiah 2:3 had occurred as truly as the coming of Elijah before the day of the Lord.

If the present writer understands W. D. Davies correctly, this provides legitimate grounds for criticizing his principle hypothesis for the "depression" of the land-promise in the New Covenant era.[43] Indeed, it may be argued from Part 2 of this study, that the land-promise was not so much depressed by some as it was transformed or spiritualized, if not ignored. What seems to be Davies' principal hypothesis for reaching his rather negative conclusions in respect to the land is as follows:

> What created a crisis both within Judaism and the contiguous Jewish-Christianity was no "speculation" or even "conviction": it was a brute historical fact. Before Jerusalem had become the center of the New Israel on Mt. Zion, a community had emerged

---

[43] Davies, Gospel and Land, pp. 369-370.

> in response to Jesus, the Messiah, which dispensed with the Oral Law as unnecessary to salvation. Outside the land, outside the Law, there was a Messianic activity, transcending old distinctions, the fence of the Torah, an activity which could not be masked or made innocuous by speculation. What were Judaism and Jewish-Christianity to make of this fact?[44]

Justin's answer was to affirm in faith that the word of the Lord regarding the true law and true worship of God had gone forth from Jerusalem and therefore preceded the conversion of the Gentile!

That this is Justin's understanding of the order of events and that Justin's position contradicts Davies' conclusion is made clear in spite of the destruction of Jerusalem mentioned in Dialogue 108:3. The passage that affirms the present writer's conclusion is Dialogue 109 where express reference is made to Micah. Whatever else in prophecy which has not yet taken place will occur at the Second Advent (110:5). It should be noted, however, that Davies' thesis is substantiated in part. Part 2 of this study is in substantial agreement with Davies' position concerning the literature in which the promise of blessing in the land was not regarded as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. Part 3 of this study would stand in diametric opposition to the conclusion of Davies concerning the territorial and apocalyptic significance the land-promise theme still held for some Christians.

Two other traditions deserve mentioning. The Dialogue maintains that Jerusalem will be rebuilt and the enjoyment of the millennium will take place. Justin admits, however, that this is not a belief held by all Christians (80:1-5).[45] The motif of the tree of life as representative of Paradise is clearly reflected in terms of the Last Age sharing the primordial bliss of the First Age (81:2-4).

---

[44] Ibid., p. 371.

[45] L. W. Barnard maintained that Justin held two contradictory views and that the Jewish War of A.D. 132-135 "affected his eschatology." "Justin Martyr's Eschatology," pp. 93-95. We maintain, however, that there is no contradiction in Justin's apocalyptic schemata. Dialogue 113:1-5 elucidates 80:1-5. For Justin, the millennium is the inauguration of the Age to Come.

In conclusion, we maintain Stylianopoulous' position is essentially correct. The Dialogue was intended for Christians and Jews, though pagans were certainly in view.[46] The original philosophy sent down is God's philosophy (perhaps true wisdom symbolized by the old man in the prologue).

This was in substance grasped by the Hebrew prophets alone from Moses on (perhaps even by Abraham). The true philosophy was ultimately made clear in Christ: Christianity is the true philosophy.

In the past pagan philosophers saw the primordial philosophy but did not adequately perceive it. Some pagans were inaccurate in their perception -- as bad as the Gnostics were later. Some had a better grasp of the truth, such as Socrates. God's election of Israel and her saints guaranteed preservation of the main points of this Wisdom: God's revelation was preserved and proclaimed by the prophets and recorded in scripture.

Man left to his sinful nature, however, rejected it -- i.e. Israel became as pagans. Hence the Dialogue is exposition of God's revelation to man -- a revelation made primarily through Israel although elements of his revealed Wisdom could be grasped by men such as Socrates or Plato.

This is not a defense in the sense of Justin's apologies for legal recognition, etc., but a setting forth of God's attempt to lead fallen men to the true philosophy -- i.e. the true Wisdom of God through Jesus by faith. If men accept this, then they once again (as Adam before the fall) become God's people and Abraham's elected seed, and receive therefore the promised blessings of salvation in the land. It is more universal in scope than Luke-Acts. The proclamation does not begin in Jerusalem and end in Rome. It begins with the primordial revelation of the wisdom leading to God which through Christ may embrace the whole human race, and ends in the apocalyptic hope of all the blessings associated with the land-promise theme. It remained for Irenaeus to expand this concept with his well developed theory of recapitulation.

---

[46] Stylianopoulous, Justin and Law, pp. 184-185.

CHAPTER 6

THE WEST

IRENAEUS' AGAINST HERESIES

In the opinion of many scholars, Irenaeus is both the most important and the first great catholic theologian of the second century.[1] This evaluation is not without substance. It depends almost exclusively on the magnum opus Against Heresies in which Irenaeus advanced an antignostic argument based squarely on both the Old and New Covenant scriptures and the apostolic tradition preserved in the catholic Church.[2]

It is probable that Irenaeus wrote Against Heresies between A.D. 180-190.[3] Unfortunately, Against Heresies is somewhat cumbersome in its repetitions, prolixity, and lack of systematic arrangement. Various propositions could explain this. As Quasten suggests, Irenaeus may have written Against Heresies in various stages.[4] The amount of time Irenaeus allowed for composition and the variety of sources he used may have made a systematic arrangement of Against Heresies impractical or impossible.[5]

---

[1] Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, pp. 287, 294; Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 110; Jurgens, Faith of Early Fathers, p. 84; Robert F. Brown, "On the Necessary Imperfection of Creation: Irenaeus' Adversus Haeresis IV, 38," Scottish Journal of Theology, 28, 1975, p. 17 (hereafter cited as "Necessary Imperfection of Creation"); Cross-Livingstone, ODCC, p. 173.

[2] Martin Widman, "Irenäus und seine theologischen Väter," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 54, 1957, p. 173 (hereafter cited as "Irenäus"); von Campenhausen, Formation of the Christian Bible, pp. 182, 185, 189-190.

[3] Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, p. 185: "um 180-185." Jurgens, Faith of Early Fathers, p. 84: "between the years 180 and 199 A.D." For the tradition of the text see Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, pp. 290-291. All citations of Against Heresies are from The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, revised by A. Cleveland Coxe, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; American reprint of the Edinburgh edition, 1885, vol. 1. This volume follows the edition of W. Wigan Harvey. See page 138, note 8.

[4] Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 289.

There is no unanimity among scholars concerning all the sources that Irenaeus both used and reflects in Against Heresies.[6] There is a general consensus among scholars however that Irenaeus utilized the following: most of the Old and New Covenant scriptures; Clement of Rome (Against Heresies, iii.3.3); the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (Romans 4:1 in Against Heresies, v. 28. 4; Polycarp 3:2 or possibly Ephesians 7:2 in Against Heresies, iii. 16.6); Papias (Against Heresies v. 33.3-4); Polycarp (Against Heresies, iii.34); Hermas (Against Heresies, iv. 20.2); Justin and Gnostic writings and teachings.[7] On the whole, Loofs' theory that Irenaeus made use of the lost works of Theophilus of Antioch has not been widely accepted.[8]

---

[5] To the present writer's knowledge, this has not been suggested previously. If Irenaeus were capable of a more systematic arrangement of the material, this explanation seems the most probable.

[6] Gustaf Wingren, Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus, trans., Ross MacKenzie, Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1959, p. xix (hereafter cited as Man and the Incarnation).

[7] For a more detailed analysis of Irenaeus' use of sources see the following: F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914, pp. 22 ff. (hereafter cited as Irenaeus of Lugdunum); Juan Ochagavía, S. J., Visible Patris Filius: A Study of Irenaeus' Teaching on Revelation and Tradition, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 171, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1964, pp. 32-42 (hereafter cited as Visible Patris Filius); Grant, "The Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years," p. 422.

[8] Loofs' theory is either rejected or considered highly questionable by the following: F. R.Montgomery Hitchcock, "Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus," Journal of Theological Studies, 38, 1937, pp. 130-139 and 255-266; Quasten, Patrology, vol. 1, p. 290; Wingren, Man and the Incarnation, pp. xvi-xx; Altaner-Stuiber, Patrologie, pp. 111-112; Lucien Regnault, O. S. B. "Irénée De Lyon: IV. Originalité et Influence," Dictionnaire de Spiritualité: Ascétique et Mystique, Doctrine et Histoire, edited by M. Viller et al., 7 vols., Paris: Beauchesne, 1971, 7:2; cols. 1966-1967. Loofs' theory is either accepted in part or in full by the following: John Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus, London: The Epworth Press, 1948, p. 137; Cross-Livingstone, Oxford Dictionary of the Church, p. 713. Ochagavía seems to leave the question open: Visible Patris Filius, p. 32.

UMI

Although scholars have agreed that the work is a refutation of Gnosticism, they have analyzed Against Heresies in various ways. Robert F. Brown suggests that most scholars structured their approach to Against Heresies in respect to two major themes.[9] Some stressed the theme of the ultimate perfection of mankind in respect to the emphasis of the Eastern or Greek Fathers on the "deification" of mankind. Others, notably John Lawson, stressed the biblical theology in Against Heresies with a particular emphasis on the theme of the restoration of man. To a less extent, some scholars endeavored to integrate both of these themes with equal balance.

Martin Widman indicates another problem in the analysis of the significance of the theological content in Against Heresies.[10] This problem involves one's conclusions in respect to the evaluation of the sources reflected in Against Heresies. Friedrich Loofs and Gustaf Wingren represent two opposite positions in this regard. Loofs concluded there were about seven different and sometimes contradictory theological perspectives in Against Heresies.[11] To some extent, Irenaeus was successful in harmonizing these different perspectives.[12] In opposition to Loofs, Wingren concluded that Irenaeus primarily used the Old and New Covenant scriptures. Moreover, Irenaeus was the first to make extensive use of Paul and John. To a less extent, Irenaeus availed himself of earlier Christian teachings for his own purpose. Irenaeus, therefore, advanced his own fundamental understanding of catholic doctrine as a refutation of Gnostic teachings and misconceptions.[13]

---

[9] Brown, "Necessary Imperfection of Creation," p. 17. This is intended as a generalization. Martin Widman, for example, stressed the theme of the economy of salvation in Irenaeus and persuasively argued that Irenaeus' primary purpose in Against Heresies was to refute Gnosticism with sound catholic doctrine: "Irenaeus," pp. 170, 173; cf. von Campenhausen, Formation of the Christian Bible, pp. 187-188.

[10] Widman, "Irenaeus," pp. 157-158.

[11] Loofs, Theophilus von Antiochen Adversus Marcion, pp. 16, 103, 211, 313, 325.

[12] Ibid., pp. 337-338, 342.

[13] Wingren, Man and the Incarnation, pp. xix-xxii; von Campenhausen, Formation of the Christian Bible, pp. 207-208, 305-306.

D. E. Jenkins criticized Wingren's thesis. Jenkins proposed that Irenaeus was preoccupied "with the problem of refuting Gnosticism" and was not "strictly speaking" concerned with advancing a theological position to any significant degree.[14] Many scholars, however, argued that in Against Heresies, when Irenaeus refuted and condemned the various teachings of Gnosticism, he also provided his own understanding of Christian doctrine as representative of the true theological teaching and knowledge acceptable in the catholic Church.[15] This latter evaluation, in the main, is our understanding of Against Heresies.

We believe that Irenaeus was essentially a biblical theologian who chose "to fight the heretics on their own ground."[16] The Gnostics appealed to an apostolic and secret oral tradition in order to substantiate their theological position. Irenaeus also maintained there was an apostolic tradition in addition to the scriptures. After the apostles had been enlightened by the Lord and the Holy Spirit, they passed down this tradition through the apostolically ordained bishops (i.9.1, 5 and 10.1-2; iii. 5.1). The catholic church is the vessel in which the apostolic tradition is faithfully preserved. The Church openly proclaims this tradition (iii.24.1). Further, this tradition confirms the scriptures. Hans von Campenhausen articulates this point very well:

> If there were no Scriptures, then it would be to her teachings alone that men would have to hold fast. But in fact we do have the Scriptures, and out of them the original truth can be far more clearly and incontrovertibly brought to light. The teaching of the Church is thus in

---

[14] See D. E. Jenkins' review of Gustaf Wingren's book in The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, 12, 1961, p. 93.

[15] Cf. John R. Willis, History of Christian Thought, pp. 93-94; H. B. Swete's foreword to Hitchcock's Irenaeus of Lugdunum.

[16] E. Flesseman-Van Leer, Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church, Assen: Van Gorcum and Comp. N. V., 1954, pp. 102, 103, 105- 114-115; R. P. C. Hanson, Tradition in the Early Church, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 144-147.

> substance identical with the teaching of the Scriptures, and it is out of these Scriptures that the heretics are now finally to be convicted and refuted.[17]

It is against the background of this understanding of Against Heresies that we will examine the land-promise theme.

EXEGESIS: AN OVERVIEW

In Against Heresies, Irenaeus reflects most of the beliefs that Justin held in respect to the land-promise theme and the traditions associated with it: a) the Church as the true Israel; b) the Patriarchal, Mosaic and Davidic-Zionic traditions; c) the tension between a realized and future apocalyptic in respect to Isaiah 2 and Micah 4; d) the inaugural messianic age; 3) the paradise motif in terms of the Last Age's similarity to the First Age. Irenaeus, however, brings a greater dimension to these themes:

> Irenaeus succeeds in combining his literalistic millenarianism, as well as his doctrines of 'Christus Victor' and of 'recapitulation,' with a theory of salvation interpreted in terms of deification. Communion with God renders man incorruptible; the vision of God makes him immortal. Through Christ man receives the light which is of the Father.[18]

By means of his theory of recapitulation in terms of the economy of salvation, Irenaeus endeavors to refute the other-worldly hermeneutic of Gnosticism. Further, he endeavors to demonstrate that from the genesis of creation to the perfection of the new creation in the Age to Come, one God -- the God of both history and eternity -- has planned and will accomplish his divine purpose.

---

[17] Von Campenhausen, Formation of the Christian Bible, p. 190.

[18] G. W. H. Lampe, "Early Patristic Eschatology," in Eschatology: Four Papers Read to The Society for the Study of Theology, by William Manson et al. (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 2), Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1952, p. 34.

The Word of God which originally made man (iv. 20.1) continued to care for men as demonstrated by the theophanies to the Old Covenant saints (iv.10.1). Ultimately, the Word became flesh in order to redeem mankind and recapitulate all things in himself (iii.16.6; v.1). Against the Gnostic position, Irenaeus championed the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh. The salvation of man involves the totality of man's body and soul (v.20.1). For this reason, the Word which made Adam became incarnate, redeemed us through his own blood, and summed up in himself the original formation of Adam so that all things might be recapitulated (v.1.1-2; 3.2; 20.1). As a result of this the elect could share in the Old Covenant promises and ultimately share eternity with God (v.21.1; 36.1-3).[19]

THE TRUE ISRAEL

Irenaeus taught that the Church as the true Israel is continuous with the saints of the Old Covenant. Unlike the Gnostics, he taught that the Old and New Covenants were not a problem or contradiction but an expression of the different ways in which God planned the salvation of men. This is clear in Against Heresies, iv.9.1, part of which is as follows:

> Now, without contradiction, He means by those things which are brought forth from the treasure new and old, the two covenants; the old, that giving of the law which took place formerly; and He points out as the new that manner of life required by the Gospel....But one and the same householder produced both covenants, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who spake with both Abraham and Moses, and who has restored us anew to liberty, and has multiplied that grace which is from Himself.

The stipulations of the Mosaic covenant were given first because men were not yet "able to see all the things of God through means of the immediate vision." The Mosaic covenant (in its original form which was not marred by scribal tradition) foreshadowed the principles of the New Covenant for the Church (iv.32.2).[20] The New Covenant and the Church are founded on the natural precepts of the Mosaic covenant (iv.32.2).[21]

---

[19] Irenaeus' concept of recapitulation is derived from Ephesians 1:9-10. See J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 2d ed., New York: Harper and Row, 1960, pp. 170-171; John S. Coolidge, "The Pauline Basis of the Concept of Sciptural Form in Irenaeus," The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, Colloquy 8, ed., Wilhelm H. Wuellner, Berkeley: The Graduate Theological Union and the University of

Like Justin (Dialogue with Trypho, 109-110), Irenaeus understood that the prophecies of Isaiah 2:3-4 and Micah 4:2-3 had already occurred in a spiritual sense. The conversion of the Gentiles had already followed the coming of the Messiah and the Zion from which the word of God would be proclaimed to the nations (Against Heresies, iv. 34.4):

> ...but from the Lord's advent, the new covenant which brings back peace, and the law which gives life, has gone forth over the whole earth, as the prophets said: 'For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem ....But...the law of liberty, that is, the word of God, preached by the apostles (who went forth from Jerusalem) throughout all the earth, caused such a change in the state of things...

Further, as in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (108-110), there is present in the apocalyptic perspective of Irenaeus a certain tension between realized and future apocalyptic hopes.[22] Although these Isaian prophecies have already been fulfilled in a spiritual sense, their ultimate fulfillment will take place at the Second Advent (Against Heresies, v. 34.1-3; 35.1; cf. Dialogue with Trypho, 110:5).

Another example of this realized and yet-to-come apocalyptic tension is evident in the Edenic planting of the Church. Because of the work of Christ, the Church (the true Israel) has been planted as a garden and the cleansing of the land has already begun in a spiritual sense:

California, 1973, p. 14 (hereafter cited as "Pauline Basis of Scriptural Form").

[20] Cf. Coolidge, "Pauline Basis of Scriptural Form," p. 3.

[21] Arthur Cushman McGiffert, History of Christian Thought, pp. 138-140.

[22] Cf. Irenaeus' Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, 61, 86 and 91-94, trans. J. Armitage Robinson, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920 (hereafter cited as Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching). Robinson discusses in detail the debt of Irenaeus to Justin Martyr (pp. 6-23).

> ...He [Christ] has finally displayed the plough, in that the wood has been joined on to the iron, and has thus cleansed His land; because the Word, having been firmly united to flesh, and in its mechanism fixed with pins, has reclaimed the savage earth. (iv. 34.4)

> For the Church has been planted as a garden... in this world; therefore says the Spirit of God, 'Thou mayest freely eat from every tree of the garden,' that is, Eat ye from every Scripture of the Lord; but ye shall not eat with an uplifted mind, nor touch any heretical discord. (v.20.2)

This present cleansing of the land adumbrates what surely will come to pass in the inaugural messianic age and the New Age which follows (v.30.4, 32.2, 35.1, 36.1-3).

Irenaeus stressed the concept of adoption to make clear that the Church is the true Israel and the seed of Abraham (iv.8.1; v.34.1). Irenaeus applied the principle of adoption to Psalm 82:1 and concluded that the Church is now the Israel of God (iii.6.1):

> He [the Spirit]...refers to the Father and the Son, and those who have received the adoption; but these are the Church. For she is the synagogue of God, which God -- that is, the Son Himself -- has gathered by Himself. Of whom He again speaks...

This brings us to our next point. Irenaeus was careful to indicate a definite continuity between the Israel of the Old and New Covenants in respect to a continuity between the covenants themselves.

THE MOSAIC TRADITION

Because of the libertarian teachings concerning moral behavior of some Gnostics, Irenaeus was careful to assert that the essence of the Mosaic covenant still endures in the New Covenant (iv.12.5). There is certain tension in the covenant of grace. It is true that it was not the old Mosaic law which the apostles proclaimed from Jerusalem. The new Israel now enjoys the New Covenant of liberty (iv.34.4). Liberty in Christ is not the freedom to sin.

The law of the covenant which was originally given to Moses was good. As Christ made clear, the Mosaic covenant was intended to be understood and obeyed through the principle of love as expressed in the two great commandemnts to love God and to love your neighbor as yourself (iv.12.3-4). The original law became mingled with the faulty traditions of Israel's theological teachers (iv. 12.1) and it was necessary that a New Covenant should supersede the Old. Because Christ was the beginning of the Mosaic covenant he therefore became its end (iv. 12.4). But in what sense is the Mosaic covenant ended?

The Mosaic covenant was not completely abrogated as some Gnostics taught (iv. 12.5). Irenaeus clearly asserted that Christ "did not abrogate the natural [precepts] of the law" but fulfilled the law and implanted "in us the varied righteousness of the law" (iv.13.1). The New Covenant affirms the unadulterated truths of the Old Covenant. Through the perspective of Christ, the New Covenant even intensifies the moral precepts of the Mosaic covenant (iv.12.1-13.2). Christians therefore are not only commanded to refrain from adultery but also "are forbidden even concupiscence" (iv.13.3). The moral force of the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant still endure in the New Covenant and reveal one divine prupose (iv.13.4):

> Inasmuch, then, as all natural precepts are common to us and to them (the Jews), they had in them indeed the beginning and origin; but in us they have received growth and completion. For to yield assent to God, and to follow His Word, and to love Him above all, and one's neighbour as one's self (now man is neighbour to man), and to abstain from every evil deed, and all other things of a like nature which are common to both [covenants], do reveal one and the same God.

The tension of the two covenants will be resolved however. Irenaeus makes clear that God, who is presently renewing Christians by the power of the Spirit (iii.17.1-4), will in the inaugural messianic kingdom renew and perfect men: "the righteous"...will wax "stronger by the sight of the Lord..." so that they will be able to "partake in the glory of God the Father" (v.35.1; cf. v.35.2). Ultimately, it is God's purpose that in the New Age the righteous "should contain the Word, and ascend to Him [Christ], passing beyond the angels, and be made after the image and likeness of God" (v. 36.3). The people of God will irresistibly fulfill the moral precepts of the Creator.[23]

---

[23] Wingren, Man and the Incarnation, p. 164.

INHERITANCE AND THE PATRIARCHAL TRADITION

Irenaeus asserts that the Church will receive the same inheritance promised to Abraham (iv.8.1). He understands this inheritance in terms of the land promised the Old Covenant saints and affirmed by the Lord's statement that "the meek shall inherit the earth" (iii.22.1). He makes this clear in deference to a Gnostic teaching that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (v.9-10; cf. 1 Corinthians 15:50).

Irenaeus endeavors to turn the Gnostic argument around and condemn them with their own rhetoric. He argues that strictly speaking it is true that flesh does not inherit the kingdom of God. The flesh which does not inherit the kingdom, however, is the flesh which has not been quickened by the Spirit -- i.e. the Gnostic heretics themselves! After the resurrection, the redeemed will possess the kingdom of God (v.9.3-4; cf. v.2.2; 3.2, 20.1). This is an apocalyptic hope of the Church. Irenaeus argues that the prophecies concerning the Second Advent will occur because those concerning the First Advent have taken place (iv.33.10-11; v.3.2; v.26.1-2).

Irenaeus gives special attention to the promise to Abraham. As did Pseudo-Barnabas and Justin earlier, Irenaeus used the Pauline argument in Galatians 3 concerning inheritance in order to conclude specifically that the promise of blessing in the land is an apocalyptic hope of the Church (v.32.2):

> If then, God promised him [Abraham] the inheritance of the land, yet he did not receive it during all the time of his sojourn there, it must be, that together with his seed, that is, those who fear God and believe in Him, he shall receive it at the resurrection of the just. For his seed is the Church, which receives the adoption to God through the Lord, as John the Baptist said: 'For God is able from the stones to raise up children to Abraham.' Thus also the apostle says in the Epistle to the Galatians: 'But ye, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise.' And again, in the same Epistle, he plainly declares that they who have believed in Christ do receive Christ, the promise to Abraham thus saying, 'The promises were spoken to Abraham, and to his seed. Now He does not say, And of seeds, as if [He spake] of many, but as of one, And to thy seed,

> which is Christ.'...Thus, then they who are of faith shall be blessed with faithful Abraham, and these are the children of Abraham. Now God made promise of the earth to Abraham and his seed; yet neither Abraham nor his seed, that is, those who are justified by faith, do now receive any inheritance in it; but they shall receive it at the resurrection of the just. For God is true and faithful; and on this account He said, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.'

Further, Irenaeus makes explicit the fact that he has in mind the historic promised land of the saints of the Old Covenant (v.34.1; cf. Jeremiah 23:6-7):

> Now I have shown a short time ago that the church is the seed of Abraham; and for this reason, that we may know that He who in the New Testament 'raises up from the stones children unto Abraham,' is He who will gather, according to the Old Testament, those that shall be saved from all the nations, Jeremiah says: 'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, the Lord liveth, who led the children of Israel from the north, and from every region whither they had been driven; He will restore them to their own land which He gave to their fathers.'

Irenaeus is emphatic that such apocalyptic expectations should not be allegorized (v.35.1):[24]

> If, however, any shall endeavour to allegorize [prophecies] of this kind, they shall not be found consistent with themselves in all points,

---

[24] John Willis seems to argue that all of this should be taken in an allegorical sense. Discussing the apocalyptic perspective of Irenaeus in Against Heresies, Willis asserts that "paragraph 61 of the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching seems to imply, however, that all of this has already taken place." History of Christian Thought, p. 104. We would agree that Irenaeus emphasized the spiritual sense in which these prophecies have already occurred: "And this has come to pass already" (Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, 61). Robinson commenting on Demonstration 61, seems to recognize the apocalyptic tension in Irenaeus:

> In V, xxxiii.4 he discusses the same question and, while recognizing that some persons give a symbolical interpretation, he inclines to look for a literal fulfilment. Here also he finds room for both interpretations.

> and shall be confuted by the teaching of the very expressions...

Irenaeus uses Paul's theme concerning inheritance in Galatians 3 to affirm unequivocably that the Church will inherit the promised land of Canaan.

It is at this point that a word of caution is in order. As we indicated in Part 1, both Brueggemann and Alfaro believe that Paul's concept of inheritance has been unduly emptied of its reference to the promised land. On the basis of this and several other points regarding the apocalyptic hope of Paul (e.g. Romans 4:13), we concluded that Paul maintained this apocalyptic hope even though it was not central to his message. Here, the judicious criticism of John S. Coolidge is to the point in respect to Irenaeus' use of Paul's themes:

> ...he [Irenaeus] characteristically produces a marked displacement of emphasis in the use he makes of quotations from Paul, drawing out certain presuppositions of Paul's arguments for the purpose of refuting various gnostic tenets but neglecting the principal intention of the arguments themselves...[25]

THE APOCALYPTIC SCHEMATA OF THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM (THE ONE THOUSAND YEARS)

Irenaeus clearly outlines the apocalyptic schemata as he understood it. Antichrist, having conquered the world, will sit in the (rebuilt?) Temple of Jerusalem and reign supreme for a period of three and one-half years. Then, the Second Advent of Christ in glory will mark the doom of Antichrist and the unbelievers (cf. 2 Thessalonians 2:1-12). For the righteous however, the Second Advent will mark the beginning of "the times of the kingdom" (v.30.4).

At this point it is appropriate to interrupt the events Irenaeus is outlining in v.30.4 and determine what is meant by the phrase "the times of the kingdom." Wingren believes that "in Irenaeus...the regnum is not described as being of a thousand years duration, but in fact corresponds to the millennium of the Book of Revelation."[26] This evaluation is good as far as it goes. Strictly speaking, Irenaeus nowhere describes the messianic kingdom as a period of one thousand years. It is clear that elsewhere, Irenaeus explicitly refers to the Revelation of John in his discussion of the apocalyptic schemata (e.g., v.38.2, v.34.2, 35.2; cf. v.36.3). This takes us no further than the conclusion of Wingren. Yet, bearing in mind the explicit references to Revelation, there is good reason to believe that Irenaeus intended that the kingdom described in the immediate context (v.30.4) be understood as lasting one thousand years.

---

[25] Coolidge, "Pauline Basis of Scriptural Form," p. 1.

[26] Wingren, Man and the Incarnation, p. 191.

In Against Heresies, v.30.4, Irenaeus unequivocably identifies the times of the kingdom as "the rest, the hallowed seventh day." The order of events remarkably parallels 2 Thessalonians 1:5-10, Revelation 19:11-20:4, and Barnabas 15:4-5 (cf. Dialogue with Trypho, 80:1-5). Moreover, Irenaeus clearly advances the tradition of the cosmic week as integral to his understanding of the apocalyptic schemata in a manner strikingly similar to Barnabas 15:4-5 (Against Heresies, v.28.3):

> For in as many days as this world was made, in so many thousand years shall it be concluded. And for this reason the Scripture says: 'Thus the heaven and the earth were finished, and all their adornment. And God brought to a conclusion upon the sixth day the works that He had made; and God rested upon the seventh day from all His works.' This is an account of the things formerly created as also it is a prophecy of what is to come. For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years; and in six days created things were completed: it is evident, therefore, that they will come to an end at the sixth thousand year.

It does not require a leap in logic, therefore, to conclude that "the times of the kingdom" which is "the hallowed seventh day" in v.30.4 is the inaugural messianic kingdom of one thousand years. Further, it is in this kingdom that the promised inheritance will be restored to Abraham and the messianic banquet will take place (v.30.4; cf. Matthew 8:11, 22:1-10; 26:29; Luke 12:37, 14:15; Revelation 3:20).

THE DAVIDIC-ZIONIC TRADITIONS AND THE PARADISE MOTIF IN RESPECT TO THE PURPOSE OF THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM

According to Irenaeus, the temporal messianic kingdom serves two principal purposes: First, it provides a concrete context in which

God can fulfill the promises to the fathers, prophets and Church (v.34.3). These promises, according to Irenaeus, must not be treated allegorically (v.35.1). Second, the temporal kingdom serves as a necessary introduction to the New Age. It serves as a period of time in which God can prepare the righteous for eternity (v.35.1-2; 36.1).

In respect to the first purpose, Irenaeus concentrates on the promises concerning the Davidic-Zionic traditions. Jerusalem will be rebuilt and Zion will be glorified. The nations will come to and "rejoice in Mount Zion...a land of wheat and wine" (v.34.3-4). Christ will reign as king and the elect will reign as princes (Against Heresies v.34.4). In support of this, Irenaeus refers to Daniel 7:27 and 12:13 (v.34.2):

> Daniel also says this very thing: 'And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of those under the heaven, is given to the saints of the Most High God, whose kingdom is everlasting, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him.' And lest the promise named should be understood as referring to this time, it was declared to the prophet: 'And come thou, and stand in thy lot at the consummation of the days.'

Irenaeus is careful, however, to relate the first purpose -- the fulfillment of the promises -- with the second purpose: that of preparing man for eternity (v.35.1):

> ...the righteous shall reign in the earth, waxing stronger by the sight of the Lord: and through Him they shall become accustomed to partake in the glory of God the Father...

In respect to the temporal kingdom as a necessary introduction to the Age to Come, Irenaeus uses the paradise motif in order to demonstrate that a purpose of the kingdom is the creatura renovata et liberata (v.33.3):

> The predicted blessing, therefore, belongs unquestionably to the times of the kingdom, when the righteous shall bear rule upon their rising from the dead; when also the creation, having been renovated and set free, shall fructify with an abundance of all kinds of food, from the dew of heaven, and from the fertility of the earth.

In support of this tradition, Irenaeus appeals to the teachings of the elders and Papias (v.33.3-4). Irenaeus compares the length of a man's life in the glorified Zion to "the days of the tree of life (v.34.4).[27]

The messianic kingdom is a time, as it were, of heaven on earth. The Last Age of the messianic kingdom is like the First Age of Eden in abundance and blessing (v.34.3):

> Promises of such a nature, therefore, do indicate in the clearest manner the feasting of that creation in the kingdom of the righteous, which God promises that He will Himself serve.

Yet, Irenaeus asserts that the purpose of this period of abundance and bliss is to discipline man for the time of incorruption. This is a point that Irenaeus later takes up after he has already introduced the subject of the new heaven and the new earth (v.35.2):

> For as it is God truly who raises up man, so also does man truly rise from the dead, and not allegorically, as I have shown repeatedly. And as he rises actually, so also shall he be actually disciplined beforehand for incorruption, and shall go forwards and flourish in the times of the kingdom, in order that he may be capable of receiving the glory of the Father.

His emphasis of this point serves both to sum up this theme in respect to the messianic kingdom and to introduce for the final time the subject of eternity as the ultimate destiny of the redeemed (v.36.1-3).

In his discussion of eternity, Irenaeus points out that it is the New Age in which the righteous will receive "those things which neither the eye has seen, nor the ear has heard, nor has [thought concerning them] arisen within the heart of man" (v.36.3). Irenaeus is cautious, however, in his apocalyptic perspective of the New Age in respect to the world God originally created (v.36.1):

> For neither is the substance nor the essence of the creation annihilated (for faithful and true is He who has established it), but 'the fashion of the world passeth away;' that is, those things among which transgression has occurred, since man has grown old in them. And therefore this [present] fashion has been formed temporary, God foreknowing all things; as I have pointed out in the preceding book, and have also shown, as far as was possible, the cause of the creation of this world of temporal things.

---

[27] Another theme related to the paradise motif is that of the virgin Eve and the Virgin Mary in v.19.1. See Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, pp. 181-183.

There remains in the theological perspective of Irenaeus a certain continuity between the beginning and the end of redemption history -- a redemption which extends to the whole creation.

Irenaeus breathes new life into the themes concerning the land. He perceives their significance through the consummate event of the incarnation of Christ. Through the light of this perspective the traditions regarding the promised land become part of the brilliant Sistine-like frescoes comprising the whole history of salvation. Irenaeus sees the beginning, middle, and consummation of "the economy of salvation" as the masterpiece of the one Artist.

CONCLUSION

Early, a problem which faced the Church was that of determining its relationship with the people and law of the Old Covenant. Perhaps central among the issues involved was the significance of the law in light of the resurrection faith. It would be insufficient, however, to think of the law in terms of the legal stipulations alone. In a larger sense, the law included the constitutive elements of the history of the people of God -- the election, covenants, promises, and conquest of Canaan.[1] The people, the culture, and the land were inextricably bound together in spite of the reality of the Dispersion. The modern statement of Moses Hess reflects remarkably well the Jewish belief with which the early Church had to come to terms:

> The greatest punishment which has been laid upon us for departing from the path which divine providence laid upon us, the punishment which most weighs us down, is that we, since we have lost the land, can no longer serve God as a nation through our institutions, which could not be continued and developed in the Dispersion, because they presume a community living in the land given to our ancestors. Yes, it is the land that we lack in order to exercise our religion.[2]

Indeed, according to the Torah, before there was the Mosaic law, the land had been promised to Abraham forever.

Through the perspective of Christ as the fulfillment of the promises, the Church maintained that it was the true Israel, continuous with the saints of the Old Covenant. This was evident as early as the writings of Paul.[3] For Paul, the Church was heir of the promises and specifically heir of the world. Various other propositions, however, were also advanced.

---

[1] Von Campenhausen, Formation of Christian Bible, p. 3.

[2] Cited by Walter Zimmerli, O.T. and the World, p. 67.

[3] Kenneth Clark, "The Israel of God," pp. 167-169; cf. Morna D. Hooker, "The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret," New Testament Studies 21, 1975, p. 47.

At one extreme, some types of Gnosticism rejected the Old Covenant scriptures and the promises they contained. The Gnostic writing, the Second Treatise of the Great Seth, unequivocably rejected any concept of a continuity with the Old Covenant saints and the promises of the Old Covenant scriptures as "a laughingstock." At the other extreme, some Jewish Christians eventually returned to Judaism because "they regarded the Jewish observances of sabbath and circumcision as still of obligation."[4]

For the most part, however, the orthodox Church understood that the Old Covenant promises were fulfilled in Christ. Many Christians largely spiritualized or transformed the historic promises. From the evidence of the sources themselves, many orthodox writings do not reflect the land-promise theme in any sense. Two writings clearly redefine the land-promise theme: The Acts of Paul and the Preaching of Peter.

Yet, other orthodox Christians retained the promise of the land as an apocalyptic hope of the Church. The Church as the true Israel, together with the saints of the Old Covenant would enjoy the promise of blessing in the land. In some of the writings of these Christians, most or all of the Old Covenant traditions associated with the land-promise theme are reflected. Revelation, Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, and Irenaeus' Against Heresies are excellent examples of this. Further, many of the writings in this group clearly indicate that one purpose of inheriting the promise of blessing in the land was so that the promise of God to the fathers might be fulfilled.

Irenaeus better than any other demonstrated the greatest sense of theological balance in his integration of this theme into his thoroughly catholic refutation of Gnosticism. Nevertheless, the importance of the land-promise theme did not long endure in catholic theology.

---

[4] Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, p. 56.

Eventually, Christ was almost exclusively understood to be the fulfillment of the Old Covenant promises. Whatever promises that lacked fulfillment were relegated to the Age to Come. For the most part, Augustine's The City of God dealt a death blow to any theological view which looked for the Old Covenant promises in terms of the historical Jewish hope of the promised land.[5] In The City of God, as Henry Chadwick put it, "the Church militant here in earth is not identifiable with God's city."[6]

> But while the devil is bound, the saints reign with Christ during the same thousand years, understood in the same way, that is, of the time of His first coming. For, leaving out of account that kingdom concerning which He shall say in the end, 'Come ye blessed of my Father, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you,' the Church could not now be called His kingdom or the kingdom of heaven unless His saints were even now reigning with Him, though in another and far different way; for to His saints He says, 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.'[7]

Yet, at present, other groups within Protestant Christianity retain the theological perspective of Irenaeus in respect to the promised land. These groups look for the restoration of Canaan as the promised land of the saints of both the Old and New Covenants. George Eldon Ladd is perhaps the most articulate spokesman of this position.[8] Whatever significance the promised land may have for the Church, for many Jews it

---

[5] The City of God, trans. and ed. Marcus Dods, 2 vols. reprint of 1871 ed., New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1948, vol. 2, pp. 363-369 (xx, 9-10).

[6] Chadwick, The Early Church, p. 226; cf. Martin Weber, The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of its Problem, rewritten in shortened form and trans. S. G. F. Brandon, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957, pp. 309-310.

[7] The City of God, pp. 363-364 (xx, 9).

[8] Ladd, The Gospel of the Kingdom, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Comapny, reprint 1971, pp. 107-140.

UMI

remains their land promise.

> ...all these years the Jews constantly and desparately sought a return to their promised land. The longing was no less intense and steadfast than the longings of Moses and the ancient Israelites and the prayers for Jerusalem became part of the Jewish soul.[9]

Once again, with the recrudesence of the Israelite State in a time of political upheaval, the Church must ponder the significance of the promised land and the nature of her involvement with both the Jew and Arab in respect to that land.

---

[9] Leon Uris, foreward to Promised Land by Abba Eban, Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson, 1978, p. 11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. SOURCES

1. Editions

Die ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen. Edited by Edgar Johnson Goodspeed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1914.

Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch und Deutsch. Edited by Joseph A. Fisher. Munich: IM Kosel-Verlag, 1956.

Die Apostolischen Väter. Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe. Edited by Karl Bihlmeyer. 2d ed., with a supplement by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Erster Teil: Didache, Barnabas, Klemens I und II, Ignatius, Polykarp, Papias, Quadratus, Diognetbrief. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.

Die Apostolischen Väter: 1, Der Hirt des Hermas. Edited by Molly Whittaker. Die Greichischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.

Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. With an English translation by Kirsopp Lake. 2 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London and New York: William Heinemann and G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.

The Greek New Testament. Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger and Allen Wikgren. 3rd ed. New York: American Bible Society, 1975.

Hermas: Le Pasteur. Edited by Robert Joly. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 53. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1958.

Irenaeus. Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis: libros quinque adversus haereses. Edited by W. Wigan Harvey. 2 vols. Cantabrigia: Typis Academicis 1857 (republished, Ridgewood: Gregg Press, 1965).

Justin Martyr. An Early Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho One to Nine. Philosophia Patrum, vol. 1. Introduction, text and commentary by J. C. M. Van Winden. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions. Translated by Michael E. Stone. Texts and translations, 2, Pseudepigrapha Series, 2. Missoula: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Testament of Job: According to the SV Text. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Texts and translations 5, Pseudepigrapha Series 4. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1974.

2. Translations

The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325, vol. 1. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Revised by A. Cleaveland Coxe. American reprint of the Edinburgh ed., 1885. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Edited by Robert Henry Charles. 2 vols. Reprint. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973.

Augustine. *The City of God*. Translated and edited by Marcus Dods. 2 vols. Reprint of 1871 ed. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1948.

The Bible. *The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha*. Revised Standard Version. Edited by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

The Dead Sea Scriptures: In English Translation. Introduction and notes by Theodor H. Gaster. 3d ed., rev. and enlarged. Garden City: Anchor Books, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976.

The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus. Newly translated and annotated by James A. Kleist. Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 6. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1948.

The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch. Newly translated and annotated by James A. Kleist. Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 1. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1946.

Eusebius. *The Church History of Eusebius*. Translated with prolegomena and notes by Arthur Cushman McGiffert. In A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: 2d ser., vol. 1. Edited by Henry Wace and Philip Schaff. Oxford and New York: Parker and Company, and the Christian Literature Company, 1890.

(Eusebius). *A New Eusebius: Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. Edited by James Stevenson. Based upon the collection edited by the late B. J. Kidd. London: SPCK, 1963.

Irenaeus. *St. Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. Translated from the Armenian with introduction and notes by J. Armitage Robinson. London: SPCK, 1920.

UMI

Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho. Translation, introduction and notes by A. Lukyn Williams. London and New York: SPCK and the Macmillan Company, 1930.

The Odes of Solomon. Edited with translation and notes by James Hamilton Charlesworth. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973.

The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. Edited and translated by Rendel J. Harris. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1909.

Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated with an introduction and notes by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953.

The Nag Hammadi Library in English. Translated by the members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity. Edited by James M. Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1977.

New Testament Apocrypha. Translated by Robert McLachlan Wilson. Edited by Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Neutestamentliche Apokryphen: in deutscher Übersetzung. 4th rev. ed. Edited by Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. 2 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1968.

Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs. Edited and translated by E. C. E. Owen. London: SPCK, 1933.

Tertullian. Adversus Marcionem. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.

B. DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPEDIAS AND CERTAIN COMMENTARIES

The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 12 vols. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.

The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible: Introduction and Commentary for Each Book of the Bible Including the Apocrypha with General Articles. Edited by Charles M. Laymon. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1971.

The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer. 12 vols. 1901. Reprint. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1964.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia. Edited by William J. McDonald. 15 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Edited by Colin Brown. 3 vols. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1975.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Rev. 2d ed. Edited by Frank L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974. Reprinted with corrections 1977.

The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich and Gerhard Kittle. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964-1976.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.

C. BOOKS

By Modern Authors Referred to in the Text

Aland, Kurt. *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe: Alte Kirche, Reformation und Luthertum, Pietismus und Erweckungsbewegung*. Berlin: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1960.

Alford, Henry. *The Greek Testament: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Revised by Everett F. Harrison. (4 vols. in 2). Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.

Allis, Oswald T. *Prophecy and the Church: An Examination of the Claim of Dispensationalists that the Christian Church is a Mystery Parenthesis which Interrupts the Fulfillment to Israel of the Kingdom Prophecies of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969.

Altaner, Berthold and Stuiber, Alfred. *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*. rev. 7th ed. Freiburg, Basel, and Wien: Herder, 1966.

Anderson, Bernhard W. *Understanding the Old Testament*. 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Aune, David Edward. The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. Supplement to Novum Testamentum. vol. 28. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

________, ed. Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 33. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Barnard, Leslie William. Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.

________. Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. 6th ed. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Bartlett, John R. The First and Second Books of the Maccabees. The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney, and J. W. Packer. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1973.

Bauer, Walter. Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. (English translation with added appendices). Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Best, Ernest. I Peter. New Century Bible. Edited by Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. London: Oliphants (Marshall, Morgan and Scott), 1971.

Bloch, Joshua. On the Apocalyptic in Judaism. The Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series 2. Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952.

Boardman, John, and La Rocca, Eugenie. Eros in Greece. New York: The Erotic Art Book Society, 1975.

Bright, John. Covenant and Promise: The Prophetic Understanding of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.

________. A History of Israel. 2d rev. ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972.

Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. New Testament History. Garden City: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.

Brueggemann, Walter. The Land. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

UMI

Brueggemann, Walter, and Wolff, Hans Walter. The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976.

Brutsch, Charles. Die Offenbarung Jesu Christi: Johannes-Apokalypse. 3 vols. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970.

Buchanan, George Wesley. The Consequences of the Covenant. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 20. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

________. To the Hebrews: Translation, Comment, and Conclusions. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.

Campenhausen, Hans von. Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries. Translated by John Austin Baker. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

________. The Formation of the Christian Bible. Translated by John Austin Baker. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Carrington, Philip. Christian Apologetics of the Second Century in Relation to Modern Thought. London and New York: SPCK and the Macmillan Company, 1921.

Chadwick, Henry. The Early Church. The Pelican History of the Church, vol. 1. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969.

Charles, Robert Henry. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.

________. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity: or Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from Pre-Prophetic Times Till the Close of the New Testament Canon. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899.

Chroust, Anton-Hermann. Aristotle: Protrepticus, A Reconstruction. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964.

Clements, Ronald E. Abraham and David: Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., 5. London: SCM Press, 1967.

________. The Conscience of the Nation: A Study of Early Israelite Prophecy. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

________. One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.

________. Prophecy and Covenant. Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 43. London: SCM Press, 1965.

UMI

________. Prophecy and Tradition. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Clifford, Richard J. The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Coats, George W. From Canaan to Egypt. Washington D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.

Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millennarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages. Rev. and expanded ed. London: Temple Smith, 1970.

Corwin, Virginia. St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Cranfield, Charles Ernest Burland. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The International Critical Commentary. 6th ed. (Entirely rewritten). 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark Limited, 1975.

Crim, Keith R. The Royal Psalms. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962.

Cripps, Richard. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos. 2d ed. London: SPCK, 1960.

Cross, Frank Leslie. The Early Christian Fathers. London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1960.

Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Cullman, Oscar. Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead: The Witness of the New Testament. London: Epworth, 1958.

Dahood, Mitchell. Psalms. 3 vols. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1966-1970.

Daniélou, Jean. A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea, Vol. 1: The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Edited and translated by John A. Baker. London and Philadelphia: Darton, Longman and Todd and the Westminster Press, 1964.

________. A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea, Vol. 2: Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture. Edited and translated by John Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press and London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973.

Davies, William David. Christian Origins and Judaism. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

________. The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1974.

________. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Dibelius, Martin. A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. English translation edited by William Adams Brown and Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Dimont, Max I. The Jews in America: The Roots, History, and Dating of American Jews. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Dix, Dom Gregory. Jew and Greek: A Study in the Primitive Church. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Dodds, Eric Robertson. The Greeks and the Irrational. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.

Doeve, Jan Willem. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: Van Gorcum and Company, N.V.-G. A. Hak and Dr. H. J. Prakke, 1953.

Donfried, Karl Paul. The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 38. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.

Downey, Glanville. A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Düring, Ingemar. Aristotle's Protrepticus: An Attempt at Reconstruction. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, vol. XII. Göteburg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1961.

Edmundson, George. The Church in Rome in the First Century. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1913.

Ellis, Peter F. The Yahwist: The Bible's First Theologian. Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1968.

Fitzmeyer, Joseph A. Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.

Flanagan, Neal M. Salvation History: An Introduction to Biblical Theology. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.

UMI

Flesseman-Van Leer, E. *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*. Assen: Van Gorcum and Company, N.V., 1954.

Foakes-Jackson, Frederick J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931.

Foakes-Jackson, Frederick J., and Lake, Kirsopp. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part 1. The Acts of the Apostles. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Company, 1920-1933.

Foerster, Werner. *Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*. Translated by Robert McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, (I) 1972, (II) 1974.

Fohrer, Georg. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. (Initiated by Ernst Sellin). Translated by David E. Green. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Fowler, Clifton L. *Building the Dispensations*. Denver: Maranatha Press, 1946.

Frend, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1967.

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965.

________. *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. London: Collins, 1961.

Glasson, T. Francis. *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology: with Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs*. London: SPCK, 1961.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchlandlung (Walter Biedermann), 1923.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Revised and enlarged by Robert M. Grant. Chicago: The Universtiy of Chicago Press, 1966.

Goppelt, Leonard. *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*. Translated by Robert A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970.

Grant, Michael. *Eros in Pompeii: The Secret Rooms of the National Museum of Naples*. (A description of the Collection by Antonio De Simone and Maria Teresa Merella). New York: William Morrow and Company, 1975.

________. The Jews in the Roman World. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.

________. Nero. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.

Grant, Robert M. After the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

________, ed. The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary. 6 vols. New York: Nelson, 1964-1968.

________. Early Christianity and Society: Seven Studies. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1977.

________. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Groningen, G. van. First Century Gnosticism: Its Origin and Motifs. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Guinan, Michael D. Covenant in the Old Testament. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1975.

Gunther, John J. St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 35. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary. Translated from the 14th edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Smith. (Translation revised and brought up to date by Robert McLachlan Wilson). Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Hagner, Donald Alfred. The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Hanson, Paul D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Hanson, Richard Patrick Crosland. Tradition in the Early Church. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

Harrison, Percy Neale. Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1936.

Hasel, Gerhard F. The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Andrews University Monograph, vol. 5. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1972.

Hayes, John H.,and Miller, J. Maxwell, eds. Israelite and Judaean History. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977.

Hiers, Richard H. *The Historical Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. University of Florida Humanities Monograph 38. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1973.

Hillers, Delbert R. *Covenant: The History of A Biblical Idea*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery. *Irenaeus of Ludgunum: A Study of His Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Hyldahl, Niels. *Philosophie und Christentum: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins*. Acta Theologica Danica, vol. IX. Copenhagen: Prostant apud Munksgaard, 1966.

Jackson, Jared Judd. "The Ark Narratives: An Historical, Textual, and Form-Critical Study of I Samuel 4-6 and II Samuel 6." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Union Theological Seminary, New York (copy in Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley), 1962.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 24. Translated by S. H. Hooke. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1958.

Johnson, Aubrey R. *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.

Juel, Donald. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 31. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

Jurgens, W. A. *The Faith of the Early Fathers: A Source-Book of Theological and Historical Passages from the Christian Writings of the Pre-Nicene and Nicene Eras*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1970.

Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, Franz J. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Pentateuch*, vol. 1. Translated by James Martin. Reprint. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.

Kelly, John Norman Davidson. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3d rev. ed. Longman Group Limited, 1972.

Kieffer, Otto. *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*. (English translation). New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1956.

Kittel, Bonnie Pedrotti, "The Composition of the *Hodayot* of Qumran." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, 1975.

UMI

Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes, and Reinink, G. J. Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 36. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Koch, Klaus. The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A polemic work on a neglected area of biblical studies and its damaging effects on theology and philosophy. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser. 22. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1970.

Köster, Helmut. Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.

Knoch, Otto. Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes: eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag (GMBH), 1964.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Rev. 17th ed. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.

Ladd, George Eldon. The Blessed Hope, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

________. "The Eschatology of the Didache." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 1949.

________. The Gospel of the Kingdom: Scriptural Studies in the Kingdom of God. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.

________. The New Testament and Criticism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.

________. Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.

________. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.

Laeuchli, Samuel. The Language of Faith: An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

LaSor, William Sanford. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.

Lawson, John. The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus. London: The Epworth Press, 1948.

UMI

Leaney, Alfred Robert Clare. The Letters of Peter and Jude: A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, A Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter. The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney, J. W. Packer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Leon, Harry J. The Jews of Ancient Rome. The Morris Loeb Series. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960.

Lesky, Albin. A History of Greek Literature. 2 ed. Translated by James Willis and Cornelius de Heer. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1963.

Levenson, Jon Douglas. Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series, no. 10. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Jr. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.

Lewis, Jack P. A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. The Apostolic Fathers. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Company, Part 1: S. Clement of Rome. 2 vols. 1890. Part 2: S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. 2d rev. ed. 3 vols., 1889.

________. The Apostolic Fathers. Edited and completed by J. R. Harmer. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974.

Lohfink, Norbert. Die Landverheissung als Eid: Eine Studie zu Gn 15. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, no. 28. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.

Loofs, Friedrich. Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 46, pt. 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinricks'sche Buchhandlung, 1930.

McCarthy, Dennis J. Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1972.

McGiffert, Arthur Cushman. A History of Christian Thought: Volume 1, Early and Eastern from Jesus to John of Damascus. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932-1933.

McKelvey, R. J. The New Temple: the Church in the New Testament. Oxford: University Press, 1969.

Magie, David. Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Manson, Thomas Walker. *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955.

Mayes, Andrew D. H. *Israel in the Period of the Judges*. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., vol. 29. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1974.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 14. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Mendenhall, George E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Pittsburg: The Biblical Colloquim, 1955.

________. *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission Corruption, and Restoration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. *Die Apokryphen Schriften zum Neuen Testament*. Bremen: Carl Schümemann Verlag, 1956.

Michel, Diethelm. *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen*. Abhandlungen zur Evangelischen Theologie, vol. 1. Bonn: H. Bouvier und Company, Verlag, 1960.

Milik, Jósef Tudeusz, ed. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1976.

Montefiore, Hugh. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by Henry Chadwick. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964.

Moore, Arthur Lewis. *The Parousia in the New Testament*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 13. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Morris, Leon. *Apocalyptic*. 2d rev. ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Commeth*. Translated by G. W. Anderson, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.

________. Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition. Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1946.

________. The Psalms in Israel's Worship. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. 2 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

Munck, Johannes. Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11. Translated by Ingeborg Nixon. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

________. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. Translated by Frank Clarke. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Nickle, Keith F. The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy. Studies in Biblical Theology, 48. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1966.

Nickelsburg, George W. E., Jr. Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Harvard Theological Studies, 26. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press and Oxford University Press, 1972.

Noth, Martin. The History of Israel. rev. 2d ed. English translation revised by P. R. Ackryod. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1960.

________. A History of Pentateuchal Traditions. Translated with an introduction by Bernhard W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Ochagavia, Juan. Visible Patris Filius: A Study of Irenaeus' Teaching on Revelation and Tradition. Orientalia Christiana Analecta, vol. 171. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1964.

Odeberg, Hugo. 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch. 1928. Reprint with a prolegomenon by Jones C. Greenfield (1972). New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1973.

Oesterley, William Oscar Emil. II Esdras: The Ezra Apocalypse. London: Methuen and Company, 1933.

O'Hagan, Angelo P. Material Re-creation in the Apostolic Fathers. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 100. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

Osborn, Eric Francis. Justin Martyr. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, vol. 47. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973.

Peel, Malcolm L. *The Epistle to Rheginos: A Valentinian Letter on the Resurrection*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine: 1, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

———. *The Finality of Jesus Christ in an Age of Universal History: A Dilemma of the Third Century*. Ecumenical Studies in History, no. 3. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.

Pernveden, Lage. *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*. Translated by Ingrid and Nigel Reeves. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966.

Prigent, Pierre. *Épître de Barnabé*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 172. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1971.

———. *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme primitif: l' Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology, Vol. 1: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*. 5th printing of 1950 edition. Utrecht-Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 1975.

Rabinowitz, Wilson G. *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of Its Reconstruction*. University of California Publications, vol. 16. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

Rad, Gerhard von. *The Message of the Prophets*. Revised by Gerhard von Rad and Eduard Haller. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, and London: Harper and Row, 1967.

———. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966.

Reicke, Bo. *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Comapny, Inc. 1964.

———. *The New Testament Era: the World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to A.D. 100*. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Reiling, Jannes. *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 37. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Richardson, Peter. *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph ser. no. 10. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Rissi, Mathias. *The Future of the World: An Exegetical Study of Revelation 19:11 - 22:15*. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d ser., 23. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1970.

Robertson, Archibald, and Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. 2d ed. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.

Rost, Leonhard. *Das Kleine Credo und Andere Studien zum Alten Testament*. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1965.

Rowley, Harold Henry. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*. Rev. ed. New York: Association Press, 1964.

Russell, David Sime. *Between the Testaments*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.

________. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 B.C. - A.D. 100*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Safrai, Samuel; Stern, Menachem; Flusser, David; and Van Unnik, W. C.. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Compendia Rerum Indaicarum ad Novem Testamentum. 2 vols. Assen: Van Gorcum and Company, (1) 1974, (2) 1976.

Salmon, Edward T. *A History of the Romany World from 30 B.C. to A.D. 138*. 3d ed. Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1959.

Sanday, William, and Headlam, Arthur C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2d ed. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.

Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971.

________. *The Several Israels and an Essay: Religion and Modern Man* The James A. Gray Lectures (1968). New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 35. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1946.

Sevenster, Jan Nicolaas. *Do You Know Greek? (How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?)*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 19. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Shepherd, Massey Hamilton, Jr. *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse*. Ecumenical Studies in Worship, no. 6. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960.

________. *The Psalms in Christian Worship: A Practical Guide*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.

Sherwin-White,Adrian Nicholas. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963.

Shotwell, Willis A. *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*. London: SPCK, 1965.

Shüpphaus, Joachim. *Die Psalmen Salomos: ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte das vorschristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, vol. 3. Edited by K. H. Rengstorf. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

Smith, George A. *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*. Expositors Bible: The Minor Prophets. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1903.

Smyth, Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Soyres, John de. *Montanism and the Primitive Church: A Study in the Ecclesiastical History of the Second Century*. 1878. Reprint. Lexington: The Americal Theological Library Association, 1965.

Stendahl, Krister, ed. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.

Strack, Hermann L. and Billerbeck, Paul. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 5 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck'she Verlagsbuchlandlung (Reprint of 1922-1926 ed. 5 vols. in 6), 1961.

Stylianopoulos, Theodore. Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law. Dissertation Series, no. 20. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975.

Tarn, William Woodthorpe. Alexander the Great. 6th reprint. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Torrance, Thomas F. The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.

Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1965.

Van Seters, John. Abraham in History and Tradition. London: Yale University Press, 1975.

Vaux, Roland de. The Early History of Israel. Translated by David Smith. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978.

Volz, Paul. Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba. Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1903.

Waddell, Helen. The Desert Fathers. 5th reprint. Ann Arbor Paperbacks: The University of Michigan Press, 1971.

Weinfeld, Moshe. Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.

Weiser, Artur. Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten. Alte Testament Deutsch Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk, 24. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955.

Wengst, Klaus. Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. 42. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.

Werner, Johannes. Des Paulinismus des Irenaeus: Eine Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung über das Verhältnis des Irenaeus zu der Paulinischen Briefsammlung und Theologie. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 6, pt. 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1889.

Werner, Martin. The Formation of Christian Dogma: A Historical Study of its Problem. Translated by S. G. F. Brandon. New York: Harper and Borthers, 1957.

Willis, John R. A History of Christian Thought: From Apostolic Times to Saint Augustine. Hicksville: Exposition Press, 1976.

Wilson, Robert McLachlan. Gnosis and the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

________. The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy. 2d ed. London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Limited. 1964.

Wingren, Gustaf. Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus. Translated by Ross MacKenzie. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1959.

Wolff, Hans Walter. Amos the Prophet: The Man and His Background. Translated by Foster R. McCurley. Edited, with an introduction by John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.

________. Hosea. Translated by Gary Stansell. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

________. Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos. Translated by Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr. and Charles A. Muenchow. Edited by S. Dean McBride, Jr. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Zahn, Theodorus (Theodor). Ignatii et Polycarpi: Epistulae Martyria Fragmenta. Patrum Apostolicum Opera, vol. 2. Lipsiae: J. C. Hinricks, 1876.

Zimmerli, Walther. Man and His Hope in the Old Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology. 2d ser., 20. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1968.

________. The Old Testament and the World. Translated by John J. Scullion. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976.

________. Old Testament Theology in Outline. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.

D. ARTICLES IN BOOKS AND PERIODICALS REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT

Alfaro, Juan I. "The Land -- Stewardship." Biblical Theology Bulletin, vol. 8, no. 2, (1978): 51-61.

Argyle, Aubrey William. "Greek among the Jews of Palestine in New Testament Times." New Testament Studies 20 (1974): 87-89.

Bailey, John William. "The Temporary Messianic Reign in the Literature of Early Judaism." The Journal of Biblical Literature 53 (1934): 170-187.

Baird, William. "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective." New Testament Studies 17 (1971): 314-327.

Barnard, Leslie William. "Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian." New Testament Studies 10 (1963-64): 251-260.

________. "The Early Roman Church, Judaism, and Jewish-Christianity." The Anglican Theological Review 49 (1967): 371-384.

________. "Justin Martyr's Eschatology." Vigiliae Christianae 19 (1965): 86-98.

________. "The Origin and Emergence of the Church in Edessa during the First Two Centuries A.D." Vigiliae Christianae 22 (1968): 161-175.

________. "The Problem of St. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians." Church Quarterly Review 163 (1963): 421-430.

________. "The Shepherd of Hermas in Recent Study" The Heythrop Journal 9 (1968): 29-36.

Barnes, Timothy David. "The Chronology of Montanism." The Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., 21 (1971): 403-408.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "New Testament Eschatology." The Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953): 136-155; 225-243.

________. "Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period." New Testament Studies 20 (1974): 234-245.

Bauckham, R. J. "The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas." The Journal of Theological Studies, N.S., 25 (1974): 27-40.

Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. "Contribution of the Book of Revelation to the Christian Belief in Immortality." The Scottish Journal of Theology 27 (1974): 76-93.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 353-379.

________. "The Millennial Hope in the Early Church." The Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953): 1-15.

Bloch, Joshua. "Some Christological Interpolations in the Ezra-Apocalypse." The Harvard Theological Review 51 (1958): 87-94.

Blythin, Islwyn. "The Patriarchs and the Promise." The Scottish Journal of Theology 21 (1968): 56-73.

Bokser, Ben Zion. "Justin Martyr and the Jews." The Jewish Quarterly Review 64 (1973-1974): 97-122 and 204-211.

Brown, Raymond Edward. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." In John and Qumran edited by James H. Charlesworth, pp. 1-8. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.

Brown, Robert F. "On the Necessary Imperfection of Creation: Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses IV, 38." The Scottish Journal of Theology 28 (1975): 17-24.

Brueggemann, Walter. "David and His Theologian." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1968): 156-181.

________. "Israel's Sense of Place in Jeremiah." In Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg. Edited by Jared J. Jackson and Martin Kessler, pp. 149-165. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1974.

Butler, Basil Christopher. "The Literary Relations of Didache Ch. XVI." The Journal of Theological Studies N. S., 11 (1960): 265-283.

Carroll, R. P. "The Elijah-Elisha Sagas: Some Remarks on Prophetic Succession in Ancient Israel." Vetus Testamentum 19 (1969): 400-415.

Charlesworth, James Hamilton. "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon." In John and Qumran edited by James H. Charlesworth, pp. 107-136. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.

Clark, Kenneth Willis. "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70." New Testament Studies 6 (1959-1960): 269-280.

________. "The Israel of God." Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 33, edited by David Edward Aune, pp. 161-169. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Coolidge, John S. "The Pauline Basis of the Concept of Scriptural Form in Irenaeus." In The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture: Colloquy 8. Edited by Wilhelm Wuellner, pp. 1-16. Berkeley: The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture (The Graduate Theological Union and the University of California at Berkeley), 1973.

Cross, Frank Moore. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History." The Harvard Theological Review, 59 (1966): 201-211.

Davies, William David. "Paul and Jewish Christianity According to Cardinal Daniélou: A Suggestion." In Judéo-Christianisme: Recherches historiques et théologieques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Daniélou. Edited by Joseph Moingt, pp. 69-79. Recherches de Science Religieuse, vol. 60. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

Drews, Paul. "Untersuchungen zur Didache." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 5 (1904): 53-79.

Drijvers, Hendrik Jan Willem. "Quq and the Quqites. An Unknown Sect in Edessa in the Second Century A.D." Numen 14 (1967): 104-129.

Duling, Dennis C. "The Promises to David and their Entrance into Christianity: Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis." New Testament Studeis 19 (1973): 55-77.

Erhardt, Arnold. "Christianity Before the Apostles' Creed." The Harvard Theological Review 55 (1962): 74-119.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "Apocalyptic and Gnosis in the Book of Revelation and Paul." The Journal of Biblical Literature 92 (1973): 565-581.

________. "The Eschatology and Composition of the Apocalypse." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1968): 537-569.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran." Theological Studies 38 (1977): 332-345.

Fohrer, Georg. "Remarks on Modern Interpretation of the Prophets." The Journal of Biblical Literature 80 (1961): 309-319.

Ford, Josephine Massingberd. "St. Paul, the Philogamist (I Cor. VII in Early Patristic Exegesis)." New Testament Studies 11 (1965): 326-348.

________. "Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?" The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 17 (1966): 145-158.

Freeman-Greenville, Gerville Stewart Parker. "The Date of the Outbreak of Montanism." The Journal of Ecclesiastical History. 5 (1954): 7-15.

Frend, William Hugh Clifford. "The Gospel of Thomas: Is Rehabilitation Possible?" The Journal of Theological Studies, N.S.,18 (1967): 13-26.

________. "The Persecutions: Some Links between Judaism and the Early Church." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 9 (1958): 141-158.

Fuks, Alexander. "Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in A.D. 115-117." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 51 (1961): 98-104.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 41 (1922): 115-136.

Glover, Richard. "The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958-1959): 12-29.

Grant, Frederick C. "The Eschatology of the Second Century." *The American Journal of Theology* 21 (1917): 193-211.

Grant, Robert M. "The Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years." *Church History* 31 (1962): 421-429.

________. "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944): 363-377.

________. "Studies in the Apologists." *The Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958): 123-134.

Greenfield, Jonas C. Prolegomenon to *3 Enoch or The Hebrew Book of Enoch* by Hugo Odeberg 1928. Reprint. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1973.

Hammerton-Kelly Robert Gerald. "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic." *Vetus Testamentum*, 20 (1970): 1-15.

Hanson, Paul D. "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment." *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 31-58.

________. "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined." *Interpretation* 25 (1971): 454-479.

________. "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 37-39.

Harvey, A. E. "The Opposition to Paul." In *Studia Evangelica*, vol. IV, pt. 1, edited by F. L. Cross, pp. 319-332. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 102. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

Hiers, Richard H. "Eschatology and Methodology." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* (1966): 170-184.

________. "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 145-155.

Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery, "Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1937): 130-139 and 255-266.

Hyatt, James Philip. "Were There an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and Independent Sinai Traidtion?" *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert Gordon May*. Edited by Harry Thomas Frank and William L. Reed, pp. 152-170. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.

James, Montague Rhodes. Introduction to *The Fourth Book of Ezra*. Edited by Robert Lubbock Bensly, pp. xi-xc. Texts and Studies Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, vol. 3, no. 2. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1895.

________. "The Rainer Fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1930-1931): 270-279.

Jenkins, David E. Review of *Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*, by Gustaf Wingren. *The Journal of Theological Studies*,N. S., 12 (1961): 92-93.

Johnson, Sherman E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl, pp. 129-142, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1975.

________. "Early Christianity in Asia Minor." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 1-17.

________. "A Subsidiary Motive for the Writing of the Didache ." In *Munera Studiosa*, edited by Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., and Sherman Elbridge Johnson, (pp. 107-122), Cambridge: The Episcopal Theological School, 1946.

________. "Unsolved Questions about Early Christianity in Anatolia." *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*. Edited by David Edward Aune, pp. 181-193. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 33. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Jonge, Marinus de. "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Fospel." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1973): 246-270.

Keck, Leander E. "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 57 (1966): 54-78.

Klijn, A. F. C. "The Influence of Jewish Christianity on the Odes of Solomon and the Acts of Thomas." In *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme*, pp. 167-177. Bibliothèque des Centres d`Étude supérilures spécialises. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965.

________. "The Study of Jewish Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 419-431.

Kraft, Robert Alan. "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and Its 'Theology'." In *Judéo-Christianisme: Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Edited by Joseph Moingt, pp. 82-92. Recherches de Science Religieuse, vol. 60. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

Krauss, Samuel. "Zion and Jerusalem: A Linguistic and Historical Study." *Palestinian Exploration Quarterly* (1945): 15-33.

Lampe, Geoffrey William Hugo. "Early Patristic Eschatology: In *Eschatology: Four Papers Read to the Society for the Study of Theology*," by William Manson, G. W. H. Lampe, T. F. Torrance, and W. A. Whithouse, pp. 17-35. (*Scottish Journal of Theology* Occasional Papers No. 2). Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1952.

La Piana, George. "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire." *Harvard Theological Review* 20 (1927): 183-403.

Ludwig, Theodore M. "The Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 345-357.

Mendenhall, George E. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 25 (1962): 66-87.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. "The 'level ground' in the Shepherd of Hermas" *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 59 (1968): 245-250.

Milgrom, Jacob. "The Temple Scroll." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 41 (1978): 105-120.

Miller, Patrick D., Jr. "The Gift of God: the Deuteronomic Theology of the Land." Interpretation 23 (1969): 451-465.

Minear, Paul S. "The Time of Hope in the New Testament." The Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953): 337-361.

Molland, Einar. "The Heretics Combatted by Ignatius of Antioch." The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 5 (1954): 1-6.

Moule, Charles Francis Digby. "Influences of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms" The Journal of Theological Studies N.S. 15 (1964): 1-15.

Munck, Johannes. "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times." New Testament Studies 6 (1959-1960): 103-116.

________. "Primitive Jewish Christianity and Later Jewish Christianity: Continuation or Rupture?" In Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme, pp. 77-91. Bibliothéque des Centres d'Étude supérieures spécialisés. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965.

Nielsen, Charles Merritt. "Clement of Rome and Moralism." Church History 31 (1962): 131-150.

________. "The Epistle to Diognetus: Its Date and Relationship to Marcion" The Anglican Theological Review 52 (1970): 77-91.

Nilson, Jon. "To Whom is Justin's Dialogue with Trypho Addressed?" Theological Studies 38 (1977) 538-546.

Pancaro, Severino. "The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of St. John." New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 396-405.

Pearson, Birger A. "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation." The Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971): 79-94.

Petuchowski, Jacob J. "Diaspora Judaism -- An Abnormality? The Testimony of History." Judaism 9 (1960): 17-24.

Quispel, Gilles. "Gnosticism and the New Testament." Vigiliae Christianae 19 (1965): 65-85.

Regnault, Lucien and Doutreleau Louis. "Irénée de Lyon (saint)." *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité: Ascétique et Mystique; Doctrine et Histoire*. Edited by Marcel Viller, F. Cavellera, J. De Guibert, A. Rayez, Z. Derville, and A. Solignac. 7 vols. Paris: Beauchesne, 1937-. Vol. 7, pt. 2, 1971: cols., 1923-1969.

Riegel, Stanley K. "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 410-415.

Rist, Martin. "Pseudepigraphy and the Early Christians." In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*. Edited by David Edward Aune, pp. 75-91. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 33. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Roberts, Jimmy Jack McBee. "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 329-344.

Rowston, Douglas J. "The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1975): 554-563.

Rubinstein, Arie. "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 13 (1962): 1-21.

Scobie, Charles H. H. "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1973): 390-414.

Scott, Robert Balgarine Young. "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds." *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958-1959): 127-132.

Shepherd, Massey Hamilton, Jr. "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956): 40-51.

________. "The Occasion of the Initial Break Between Judaism and Christianity." In *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume*. 3 vols. No named editor, vol. 2, pp. 703-717. Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965.

________. "The Rise of Christianity." In *A Short History of Christianity*, edited by Archibald G. Baker, pp. 1-32. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940.

________. "A Venture in the Source Analysis of Acts." In *Munera Studiera*, edited by Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr. and Sherman Elbridge Johnson, pp. 91-105. Cambridge: The Episcopal Theological School, 1946.

Sherwin-White, Adrian Nicholas. "Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again." The Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., 3 (1952): 199-213.

Smith, Dwight Moody, Jr. "Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on Its Character and Delineation." New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 222-244.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective." In The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl, pp. 1-17. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Stone, Michael. "Some Remarks on the Textual Criticism of IV Esra" The Harvard Theological Review 60 (1967): 107-115.

Stuhlmueller, Carol. "The Theology of Creation in Second Isaias." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 21 (1959): 429-467.

Sundberg, Albert Carl. "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List." The Harvard Theological Review 66 (1973): 1-41.

________. "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon." In Studia Patristica, vol. 4, pt. 1, pp. 452-461. Edited by F. L. Cross.Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 102. Berlin: akademie-Verlag, 1968.

Thierry, Jean Jacques. "The Logos as Teacher in Ad Diognetum XI, I" Vigiliae Christianae 20 (1966): 146-149.

Uris, Leon M. Forward to Promised Land by Abba Eban, pp. 9-15. Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson, 1978.

Yadin, Yigael. "The Temple Scroll." In New Directions in Biblical Archaeology, edited by David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield, pp. 139-148. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1969.

Walls, Andrew Finlay. "Papias and Oral Tradition." Vigiliae Christianae 21 (1967): 137-140.

Walter, Nikolaus. "Tempelzorstörung und synoptische Apokalypse." Zeitschrift für die Neutestementliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 57 (1966): 38-49.

Ward, James M. "The Message of the Prophet Hosea." Interpretation 23 (1969): 387-407.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184-203.

________. Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93 (1973): 190-199.

Weippert, Manfred. "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien: Kritische Anmerkungen zu Gerhard von Rads Konzept des 'Heiligen Krieges in alten Israel'." *Zeitschrift für alttestamentlische Wissenschaft* 84 (1972): 460-493.

White, Hugh Clayton. "The Divine Oath in Genesis." *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 165-79.

Widman, Martin. "Irenäus und seine theologischen Väter." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 54 (1957): 156-173.

Wilder, Amos Niven. "The Church and Israel in Light of Election." In *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 4:1, edited by F. L. Cross, pp. 347-357. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 102. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968.

________. "Eschatological Imagery and Earthly Circumstance." *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958-1959): 229-245.

Wilson, Robert McLachlan. "Jewish Christianity and Gnosticism." In *Judéo-Christianisme: Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Edited by Joseph Moingt, pp. 261-272. Recherches de Science Religieuse, vol. 60. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

Wolff, Hans Walter. "The Elohistic Fragments in the Pentateuch." Translated by Keith R. Crim. *Interpretation* 26 (1972): 158-173.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. "Notes on Patristic Philosophy." *The Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964): 119-131.

Wood, Arthur Skevington. "The Eschatology of Irenaeus." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 41 (1969): 30-41.

Young, Francis M. "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 19(1973): 325-338.

Zimmerli, Walter. "The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel." *Interpretation* 23 (1969): 131-157.